



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं० 41 | नई दिल्ली, अक्टूबर 2—अक्टूबर 8, 2005, शनिवार/आश्विन 10—आश्विन 16, 1927
No. 41 | NEW DELHI, OCTOBER 2—OCTOBER 8, 2005, SATURDAY/ASVINA 10—ASVINA 16, 1927

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृष्ठक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)
नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3550.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का अधिनियम सं. 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए निम्नलिखित अधिवक्ताओं को विचारण न्यायालयों में तमिलनाडु राज्य में मदुरै में केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो द्वारा उन्हें सौंपे गए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (के.अ. ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों के अभियोजन तथा विधि द्वारा स्थापित पुनरीक्षण अथवा अपील न्यायालयों में इन मामलों में उद्भूत अपीलों/पुनरीक्षणों अथवा अन्य विषय का संचालन करने के लिए विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :—

सर्वश्री

1. आर. पोन्नूचामी
2. वी. श्रीनिवासन
3. टी.एल. वीराकुमार
4. एस.आर.एस. बलराज
5. जे.एस. मुरली

[सं. 225/12/2005-एच डी -II]

चंद्र प्रकाश, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL,
PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS
(Department of Personnel and Training)
New Delhi, the 28th September, 2005

S.O. 3550.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the following Advocates as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (CBI) in the State of Tamil Nadu at Madurai as entrusted to them by the Central Bureau of Investigation in the Trial Courts, and appeals/revisions or other matter arising out of these cases in revisional or Appellate Courts established by law :—

- (i) Shri R. Ponnuchamy
- (ii) Shri V. Srinivasan
- (iii) Shri T.L. Veerakumar
- (iv) Shri S.R.S. Balraj
- (v) Shri J.S. Murali

[No. 225/12/2005-AVD-II]

CHANDRA PRAKASH, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय
(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)
(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3551.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, संलग्न अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित बैंकों/विदेशी संस्थाओं के सूचीबद्ध कार्यालयों/शाखाओं को, जिनके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

क्रम. बैंक का नाम सं.	कार्यालयों/शाखाओं की संख्या
1. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ बीकानेर एंड जयपुर	02
2. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक	473
3. विजया बैंक	84
4. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक	60
कुल	619

[फ़. सं. 11016/9/2005-हिन्दी]

रमेश बाबू अणिवेरी, संयुक्त निदेशक (राजभाषा)

अनुबंध

स्टेट बैंक ऑफ़ बीकानेर एंड जयपुर

प्रधान कार्यालय,

जयपुर

1. पावटा (जयपुर)

पता :
मुख्य बस स्टैंड के पास,
पावटा-303106
जिला-जयपुर
(राजस्थान)

2. न्यू आतिश मार्केट, जयपुर

पता :
एस-2,
न्यू आतिश मार्केट,
गोपालपुरा बाईपास रोड,
मानसरोवर,
जयपुर-302019
(राजस्थान)

भारतीय स्टेट बैंक

1. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक

करजी शाखा,
मु. पो. करजी, ता. खेड,
जिला-रत्नागिरी
पिन-415727

2. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,

दाभिल नाका शाखा,
पो. लावेल, ता. खेड,
जिला-रत्नागिरी
पिन-415708

3. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
फुणगूस शाखा,
मु. पो. फुणगूस, ता. संगमेश्वर,
जिला-रत्नागिरी
पिन-415611

4. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तिल्लोट शाखा,
मु.पो. तिल्लोट, ता. देवगड,
जिला-सिंधुदुर्ग
पिन-416804

5. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
केलूस शाखा,
मु.पो. केलूस, ता. कुडाल,
जिला-सिंधुदुर्ग
पिन-416520

6. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
प्रियोल-मंगेशी शाखा,
ता. फोंडा, जिला-उत्तर गोवा
पिन-403404

7. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गुलेली शाखा,
मु.पो. गुलेली,
ता. सत्तारी,
जिला-उत्तर गोवा,
पिन-403504

8. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
स्टाफ प्रशिक्षण केंद्र,
25-ए, "पाटो प्लाज़ा",
कदम्बा बस टर्मिनल के पास,
पणजी-गोवा
पिन-403001

9. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
स्टाफ प्रशिक्षण केंद्र,
78, कोरेगांव पार्क,
नॉर्थ मेन रोड, पुणे
पिन-411001

10. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
स्टाफ प्रशिक्षण केंद्र,
एन-7 (दक्षिण), सिडको,
जलगांव रोड, औरंगाबाद,

11. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पुनर्वास तथा वसूली शाखा,
"आर्केड" दूसरी मंजिल,
वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर,
कफ परेड, कुलाबा,
पिन-400005

12. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
प्रतिभूति सेवा शाखा,
दूसरी मंजिल,
मुंबई मुख्य शाखा परिसर,
मुंबई समाचार मार्ग,
मुंबई-400023

13. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आंचलिक कार्यालय, मुंबई-I
88 सी, डी जी पी हाऊस,
जूना प्रभादेवी मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 025
14. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आंचलिक कार्यालय, मुंबई-II,
88 सी, डी जी पी हाऊस,
जूना प्रभादेवी मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 025
15. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भायखला शाखा,
पो. बैंग क्र. 22,
340, जो जे मार्ग, भायखला,
मुंबई-400 008
16. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चर्चगेट शाखा,
"द इन्टरनैशनल", महर्षि कर्वे रोड,
पो. बै. क्र. 11179,
चर्चगेट, मुंबई-400 020.
17. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कफ परेड शाखा,
6, "आर्केड" वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर,
कफ परेड कुलाबा,
मुंबई-400 005
18. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दादर शाखा,
स्वामी ज्ञानजीवनदास पथ,
दादर पोस्ट ऑफिस के पास,
दादर, मुंबई-400 014.
19. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जुहु तारा शाखा,
"श्री ललीता"
फ्लाईन्ग क्लब के पास,
जुहु तारा रोड,
जुहु, मुंबई-400 049.
20. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जुहु विले पार्ले स्कीम शाखा,
प्लॉट क्र. 9, योगी स्मृती,
10वां मार्ग, जुहु विले पार्ले विकास योजना,
मुंबई-400 057.
21. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लिंकिंग मार्ग शाखा,
बांद्रा, मुंबई-400 052.
22. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मादाम कामा पथ शाखा,
पो. बै. नं. 11588,
मादाम कामा रोड,
मुंबई-400 021.
23. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
माहीम शाखा,
विजन अपार्टमेंट्स,
लेडी जमशेदजी मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 016
24. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मांडवी शाखा,
पो. बै. क्रमांक 3217,
75, अब्दुल रेहमान मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 003.
25. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मायकर चेक प्रक्रिया केन्द्र,
माधुली, पहली मंजिल,
एच-2, शिवसागर इस्टेट,
डॉ. एनी बेसेंट रोड, वरली,
मुंबई-400 018.
26. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नेपीयन सी रोड शाखा,
लक्ष्मी विलास,
87, नेपीयन सी रोड,
पो. बै. 6151, मुंबई-400 008.
27. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पेडर रोड शाखा,
मुंबई-400 026.
28. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सांताक्रुज (पश्चिम) शाखा,
मुंबई-400 054.
29. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सेवा शाखा,
7, किलिक हाऊस,
चरनजीत राय मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 001.
30. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विशेष वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा,
मुंबई समाचार मार्ग,
पत्र पेटी क्र. 1965,
मुंबई-400 023.
31. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
टर्नर रोड (बांद्रा) शाखा,
3/35, मेहेरदाद टर्नर रोड,
बांद्रा (पश्चिम),
मुंबई-400 050.
32. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाकोला शाखा,
सांताक्रुज (पूर्व) शाखा,
मुंबई-400 055.
33. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विले पार्ले (पूर्व) शाखा,
पो. बै. क्र. 0877,
मुंबई-400 057.

34. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वरली (उत्तर) शाखा,
निरलॉन हाऊस,
डॉ. एनी बीसेंट मार्ग
वरली, मुंबई-400 025
35. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एंटीप हिल शाखा
क्वार्टर क्र 1329 एण्ड 1330
सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट कॉलोनी
काणे नगर, ऐंटापहिल,
मुंबई-400 037
36. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ऑगस्ट क्रांति मैदान शाखा
जमशेद हॉल, फोरजेट मार्ग,
गोवालिया टंक पथ
मुंबई-400 038
37. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भुलाभाई देसाई मार्ग शाखा,
भुलाभाई देसाई मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 026
38. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डी एन रोड शाखा,
7, किलिका हाऊस,
चरनजीत राय मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 001.
39. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धारावी शाखा,
डायमंड अपार्टमेंट,
जास्मीन मिल रोड माहीम (पू),
मुंबई-400 017
40. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
फोर्ट मार्केट शाखा,
भगवान भुवन,
71-73 मिंट रोड,
मुंबई-400 001
41. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गेटवे ऑफ इंडिया शाखा,
राम निमी, 8, मंडलिक रोड,
कुलाबा, मुंबई-400 039.
42. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गिरगांव शाखा,
पी. बी. क्रमांक 3611,
मुंबई-400 004
43. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हयुजिस मार्ग शाखा,
अदरबाद 34, हयुजिस रोड
मुंबई-400 007
44. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जेकब सर्कल शाखा,
सिंपलेक्स मिल्स कंपाउंड,
केशवराव खाडे मार्ग,
पी. बी. क्रमांक 6258,
मुंबई-400 011
45. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कालाचौकी शाखा,
अभ्युदय एज्युकेशन सोसा,
हाय स्कूल अभ्युदय नगर,
मुंबई-400 037
46. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
केम्पस कॉर्नर शाखा,
अनमोल रत्न परिसर को-ऑप. हा. सो. लि.
उमर पार्क 95, बोमनजी पेटीट लेन
मुंबई-400 026
47. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लालबाग शाखा,
75 डॉ आंबेडकर रोड,
कालाचौकी, पो. ब. क्र. 7818
मुंबई-400 033
48. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लोअर पेरल शाखा,
मधुसूदन मिल्स कंपाउंड,
पांडुरंग बुध्व मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 013
49. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डॉ. एम. एल. डहागुकर शाखा,
इंदिरा अपार्टमेंट्स,
डॉ. एम. एल. डहागुकर मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 026
50. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मसजिद बंदर शाखा,
राजगोर चम्बरस,
मसजिद लो लेवल पथ,
पी. बी. क्रमांक 5211
मुंबई-400 009
51. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
माटुंगा शाखा,
गुजरात बेतलवनी महल,
76-ए "रफी अहमद क्वादरई पथ",
माटुंगा मुंबई-400 019
52. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
माझगांव शाखा,
वी. पी. टी. वर्कशॉप,
पुराना सी. ए. एस. कार्यालय,
तल माला, निरमन भवन के सामने,
नरतु विठेबा नाखवा मार्ग,
माझगांव, मुंबई-400 010
53. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बॉम्बे मेट्रो स्टेशन शाखा,
पी. बी. क्रमांक 4515,
मुंबई-400 095

54. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नायगांव (दादर) शाखा,
एस. एस. वाध मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 014
55. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नरीमन पॉइंट शाखा,
दलामल हॉऊस,
जमुनालाल बजाज मार्ग,
नरीमन पॉइंट,
मुंबई-400 021
56. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
परेल टी. टी. शाखा,
मित्रधाम को ऑप. हाऊसिंग सोसायटी,
जे. बी. मार्ग मुंबई-400 012
57. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सिवरी शाखा,
टाकसी जीवराज मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 015
58. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिवाजी पार्क शाखा,
वेस्ट दादर को-ऑप हाऊसिंग सोसायटी बिल्डिंग,
रानडे रोड दादर,
मुंबई-400 028
59. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिव सागर इस्टेट वरली (दक्षिण) शाखा,
पी. बी. क्रमांक 16555
डॉ. एनी बिसेंट रोड,
वरली मुंबई-400 018
60. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वीर सावरकर मार्ग शाखा,
ऋग्वेद को-ऑप सोसायटी बिल्डिंग,
केडेल रोड, मुंबई
61. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वडाला शाखा,
पोदार हॉऊस,
आर. ए. किडवई रोड
मुंबई-400 031
62. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वालकेश्वर शाखा,
244 विधानी कॉटेज,
वालकेश्वर रोड मुंबई-400 006
63. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बुडहाऊस रोड शाखा,
ललित बिल्डिंग,
पी. बी. क्रमांक 10021
कोलाबा मुंबई
64. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वरली सीफेस शाखा,
सागर तरंग को-ऑप हाऊसिंग सोसायटी,
अब्दुल गफार खान रोड,
मुंबई-400 030
65. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा
चारिविले ए रोड चर्चगेट (पश्चिम)
मुंबई-400 020
66. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चेम्बूर शाखा,
एम. डी. एस मार्ग,
चेम्बूर, मुंबई-400 071
67. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अंधेरी (पूर्व) शाखा,
वृन्दावन, सर एम. बी. रोड
मुंबई-400 069
68. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अंधेरी (पश्चिम) शाखा,
राहुल अपार्टमेंट्स,
स्वामी विवेकानंद मार्ग,
अन्धेरी (पश्चिम),
मुंबई-400 058
69. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बोरीवली (पूर्व) शाखा,
"मनोदया"
दत्तपाडा पाठक मार्ग,
बोरीवली (पूर्व)
मुंबई-400 066
70. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बोरीवली (पश्चिम) शाखा,
ओमसदन, घोडबंदर मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 092
71. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गोरेगांव (पश्चिम) शाखा,
9 जवाहर नगर,
स्वामी विवेकानंद मार्ग,
गोरेगांव (पश्चिम)
मुंबई-400 062
72. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आइ ए सी सी शाखा,
बम्बई हवाई अड्डा,
सहार गांव के नजदीक,
मुंबई-400 057
73. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कांदिवली (पश्चिम) शाखा,
शांतीलाल मोदी मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 067
74. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मालाड (पश्चिम) शाखा,
एस. बी. रोड,
चिंचोली फाटक के पास,
मालाड (पश्चिम),
मुंबई-400 064

75. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कुर्ला (पश्चिम) शाखा,
171 लालबहादुर शास्त्री मार्ग,
कुर्ला, मुंबई-400 070
76. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मरोल शाखा,
चन्द्र अपार्टमेंट्स, मरोल मरोशी मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 059
77. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वसोवा शाखा,
अंधेरी वसोवा मुख्य मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 058
78. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
घाटकोपर (पूर्व) शाखा,
महात्मा गांधी मार्ग
मुंबई, महाराष्ट्र-400 077
79. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कल्याण (शाखा),
जि. ठाणे,
ठाणे-421 301
80. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक
नौपाडा ठाणे शाखा
425, गोखले मार्ग,
जि. ठाणे,
ठाणे-400 602
81. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ठोण शाखा,
ठाणे-400 601
82. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अधई शाखा,
अधई तालुका शाहपुर,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
83. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अम्बरनाथ शाखा,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
84. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बदलापूर इंडस, ईस्ट शाखा,
शेड क्रमांक डब्ल्यू 68,
एम आई डी सी क्षेत्र पोस्ट कुलगांव,
तालुका उल्हासनगर,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र-421 503
85. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बी ए आर सी शाखा,
केंद्रीय प्रशासनिक भवन, ट्रॉम्बे,
मुंबई-400 085
86. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बेस्ट डिपो (कुर्ला) शाखा,
एल. बी. एस मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 070
87. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भांडुप शाखा,
मुंबई-400 078
88. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भिवंडी शाखा,
ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
89. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
देवनार शाखा,
देवनार बस डिपो
मुंबई-400 088
90. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डोंबिवली (पूर्व) शाखा,
ब्रम्हचैतन्य, तिलक रोड
डोंबिवली (पूर्व) जिला ठाणे
91. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
फोकल पॉइंट शाखा,
अनुराधा इंड. कंपाऊंड,
कुर्ला अंधेरी रोड
मुंबई-400 078
92. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गो-हे शाखा, पो.ओ. गो-हे
पोर्ट मनोर होकर,
तालुका वाडा,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
93. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आई. आई. टी पवई शाखा,
मुंबई 400 076
94. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जव्हार शाखा,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
95. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जेकेग्राम शाखा,
जय टावर, कैडबरी के सामने,
463 पोखरण रोड,
ठाणे-400 601
96. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कांजूरमार्ग शाखा,
आकाश दीप,
कांजूर विलेज रोड,
मुंबई-400 078
97. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
माहुल रोड (चेंबूर) शाखा,
मुंबई-400 074
98. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुलुंड (पश्चिम) शाखा,
लक्ष्मी महादेव निवास
सेवाराम दादलानी मार्ग
मुलुंड (पश्चिम), मुंबई-400 080

99. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुलुंड (पूर्व) शाखा,
ठाणे महाराष्ट्र
100. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ठाणे क्रिक शाखा,
ठाणे बदलापुर रोड,
पो. घंसेली जि. ठाणे,
मुंबई-400 701
101. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सफेदपुल शाखा,
अनुराधा इंडस्ट्रीयल कैम्प,
मथुरादास विसनजी मार्ग,
(कुर्ला-अंधेरी मार्ग) मुंबई-400 078
102. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
साकीनाका शाखा,
विहार लेक रोड,
मुंबई-400 078
103. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शाहपुर शाखा,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
104. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विशेष लघु उद्योग व्यवसाय घाटकोपर (प) शाखा,
अशोक सिल्क मिल्स कंपाउंड
पहला माला, एल.बी.एस. मार्ग,
घाटकोपर (प) मुंबई-400 086
105. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
स्वास्तिक पार्क (चेम्बूर) शाखा,
सायन ट्रॉम्बे रोड,
पो. बें. नं. 17236,
मुंबई-400 071
106. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ठाणे (पू.) शाखा,
नादब्रम्ह आदर्श निवास,
ठाणे-400 603
107. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
उल्हासनगर शाखा,
जि. ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
108. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विहारलेक शाखा,
नीटि कैम्पस
मुंबई-400 067
109. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विक्रोली (पू) शाखा,
वि. क्र. 2 कन्नमवार नगर
विक्रोली (पू)
110. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विक्रोली (प.) शाखा,
स्टेशन रोड
मुंबई-400 079
111. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाडा शाखा, पो. ऑ. वाडा
ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
112. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा, सायन (प)
मुंबई-400 022
113. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा,
101 डेल्टा, हिरानंदानी गार्डन्स
पवई मुंबई-400 076
114. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ठाणे कलेक्टोरेट कैम्पस शाखा,
नेताजी सुभाष बोस रोड,
मुंबई-400 601
115. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बसीन शाखा, पो. बॉ. क्रमांक 1,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
116. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वसई तालुका इन्डस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट शाखा,
अचोला गांव, तालुका वसई,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र
117. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भायन्दर शाखा,
स्टेशन रोड ता. वसई,
जिला ठाणे,
महाराष्ट्र-401 101
118. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कार्टर रोड शाखा,
गोल्डन रॉक अनेक्स,
मास्टर विनायक क्रॉस रोड,
(पैरी क्रॉस रोड), (बांद्रा (प.)
मुंबई-400 050
119. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डहाणू रोड शाखा,
डाक घर डहाणू मार्ग,
जिला ठाणे, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन कोड-400 602
120. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दहिसर (पूर्व) शाखा,
देव आशिष शॉपिंग और सर्विस इन्ड. इस्टेट,
सर भरुचा मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 068
121. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मालाड (पू) शाखा,
फिल्का भवन, पोदार मार्ग,
पो. बैंग क्रमांक-17604
मुंबई-400 064

- | | |
|---|---|
| 122. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मिरा इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट शाखा
प्लॉट क्रमांक 53 हिस्सा क्रमांक 4
मिरा रोड पोस्ट ऑफिस,
मिरा, जिला ठाणे | 134. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुरुड शाखा,
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र-402 401 |
| 123. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नवघर वर्ल्ड रोड शाखा,
जि. ठाणे महाराष्ट्र | 135. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नागोठणे शाखा,
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र-402 406 |
| 124. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पाली मार्केट बान्द्रा (पश्चिम) शाखा
डॉ. आंबेडकर मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 050 | 136. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नांदगांव शाखा,
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र |
| 125. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अलीबाग शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 201 | 137. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नावा शिवा शाखा,
पोर्ट यूसर्स बिल्डिंग,
जेएनपीटी, नवी मुंबई |
| 126. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आंबेट शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र 402 101 | 138. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पनवेल शाखा,
278, साफिया टेरेस,
एम. जी. रोड, पनवेल,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-410206 |
| 127. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बीएपीएमसी शाखा,
नवी मुंबई-400 707 | 139. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पेडली एस ए बी शाखा,
तालुका सुधागड
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र 410 405 |
| 128. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जे.एन.पी.टी. शाखा,
तालुका ऊरण,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 101 | 140. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पेण शाखा,
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र 402 107 |
| 129. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कामोठे शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 206 | 141. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पोयनाड शाखा,
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र 402 108 |
| 130. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
खोपोली शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
तालुका कर्जत,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-410 203 | 142. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रसायनी शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र 402 107 |
| 131. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कोंकण भवन शाखा, नवी मुंबई,
सिडको भवन
महाराष्ट्र-400 614 | 143. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रोहा शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402107 |
| 132. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
महाड शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 301 | 144. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सालव शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402210 |
| 133. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
माणगांव शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 104 | 145. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सावद बी बी शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402301 |

146. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
श्रीवर्धन शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 210.
147. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सुधागढ़ पाली शाखा,
जिला रायगड
महाराष्ट्र 402 205
148. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
थल बाजार शाखा,
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 207.
149. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
थल वायशेत शाखा,
तालुका अली बाग
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402207.
150. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अपर तुदील शाखा,
तालुका महाड
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र
151. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
उरण शाखा,
तालुका उरण
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र
152. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाकण एस ए बी शाखा,
तालुका पोलादपुर
जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र
153. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाशी तुर्भे शाखा,
पी.ओ.के.यू. नवी मुंबई
जिला रायगड महाराष्ट्र-400705.
154. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जीरद शाखा,
तालुका अलीबाग जिला रायगड,
महाराष्ट्र-402 201.
155. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एवर शाईन नगर शाखा,
मालाड (पश्चिम), मुंबई-400 064.
156. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बांद्रा (पूर्व) शाखा,
जेलेस एण्डुकेशन सो. भवन
गव्हरमेंट कालोनी, मुंबई-400 051.
157. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गोरेगांव (पू.) शाखा,
एपीएसपीएन बिल्डिंग
12 जयप्रकाश नगर, जयप्रकाश मार्ग,
गोरेगांव (पू.) मुंबई-400 063.
158. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जोगेश्वरी (पूर्व) शाखा
केवज् मार्ग दस्तूर भवन,
मुंबई-400 060.
159. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जोगेश्वरी (प.) शाखा,
राम श्याम सिनेमा के सामने
स्वामी विवेकानन्द मार्ग, मुंबई-400 060.
160. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
खार (पश्चिम) शाखा,
प्लॉट क्रमांक 81, एस वी मार्ग,
मुंबई-400 052.
161. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
माऊन्ट मेरी शाखा,
मोनालीसा जॉन बपटीस्ट मार्ग,
माऊन्ट मेरी स्टॉप के पास
बांद्रा मुंबई-400 050.
162. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पालघर शाखा, माहिम मार्ग,
जिला थाने, महाराष्ट्र
163. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शंकर गली शाखा,
पारसी हॉल के सामने
कांदिवली (पश्चिम) मुंबई-400 067.
164. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तल सरी शाखा,
पो. एवं ता. तलासरी,
जिला ठाणे महाराष्ट्र
165. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तारापुर इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट शाखा,
प्लाऊट नंबर एच-1, व्हाया बोइसर
जिला ठाणे-401501.
166. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विरार शाखा,
जिला ठाणे महाराष्ट्र
167. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विले पार्ले (प.) शाखा, इरला मार्ग,
खादी विलेज इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट,
कमिशन परिसर, मुंबई-400 053.
168. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विरवानी इंडस्ट्रीयल स्टेट शाखा,
कोहीनुर इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट,
दिन्डोशी विलेज,
गोरेगांव (पू.), मुंबई-400 063.

169. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वझीरा शाखा,
प्रसन्न नगर लोकमान्य तिलक रोड,
वझीरा, बोरीवली (पश्चिम)
मुंबई-400 092.
170. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा,
श्रीकुंज वी पी एम रोड, जुहू स्कीम
विलेपार्ले (प.) मुंबई-400 056.
171. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा,
लोखंडवाला कॉम्प्लेक्स,
रहेजा क्लासिक, लिंक रोड
ओशिवरा अंधेरी (प.), मुंबई-400 058.
172. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हतकलंगडा शाखा,
पोस्ट बैग नं. 1, हतकलंगडा,
जि. कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं. 416109
173. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विटा (खानापूर) शाखा,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं. 415311
174. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
इचलकरंजी शाखा,
जि. कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं. 416115
175. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दसरा चौक, कोल्हापुर शाखा,
लक्ष्मीपुरी, कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं. 416002
176. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मिरज शाखा,
शनिवार पेठ, मिरज,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं.-416410.
177. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सांगली शाखा, गणपती पेठ,
सांगली, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416416.
178. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गडहिंग्लज शाखा,
नेहरू चौक, जि. कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं. 416502
179. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तासगांव शाखा,
गुरुवार पेठ, तासगांव,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416312.
180. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
इस्लामपुर (वालवा) शाखा,
पोस्ट बैग नं. 1,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं.-415409.
181. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भुदरगड (गारगोटी) शाखा,
पो. बॉ. नं. 1, जि. कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र,
पि. नं.-416201.
182. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिरोल शाखा,
तालुका शिरोल, जि. कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416103.
183. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मार्केट यार्ड कोल्हापुर शाखा,
श्री शाहू मार्केट यार्ड, कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416005.
184. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पार्वती औद्योगिक एरिया शाखा,
इचलकरंजी, तालुका शिरोल,
जि. कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416121.
185. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एम. आई. डी. सी. (कुपवाड) सांगली शाखा,
कृष्णा वेली कॉम्प्लेक्स,
एम. आई. डी. सी. कुपवाड,
सांगली, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416436.
186. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आरग शाखा,
तालुका मिरज, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416401.
187. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भवानीनगर शाखा,
तालुका वालवा, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-415302.
188. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भिलवडी शाखा,
मु. पो. भिलवडी, तालुक पलुस,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416303.
189. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पलुस शाखा,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं.-416310.
190. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वानलेस हॉस्पिटल मिरज शाखा,
वानलेस हॉस्पिटल कंपाऊंड,
तालुका मिरज, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416410.
191. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कासेगाव शाखा,
तालुका वालवा, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-415404.

192. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अब्दुल लाट शाखा,
तालुक शिरोली, जि. कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416130
193. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नान्नज शाखा,
तालुक कवठेमहाकाल,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं.-413307.
194. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नागठाणे शाखा,
पो. बॉ. नं. 1, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416313
195. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
राजाराम टिबर मार्केट शाखा,
कलंबा रोड, कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं.-416 012
196. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बाबा जरगनगर शाखा,
"आनंदी स्मृति" पाचगाव,
ऑक्स्ट्राय नाके के पास,
लेआऊट नं. 4, बाबा जरगनगर,
कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416007.
197. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जत शाखा, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416404.
198. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिरोली एम. आई. डी. सी. शाखा,
सी.पी.सी. विल्डिंग,
शिरोली एम. आई. डी. सी. एरिया,
कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416122
199. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कोल्हापुर कोपागार शाखा,
आशिष चेंबर्स, 393 बी. ई. वॉर्ड,
शाहूपुरी, कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416001
200. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भुये शाखा, महसिल करवीर,
जि. कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र,
पिन नं.-416002.
201. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नेवरी शाखा, तालुका विटा खानापुर,
जि. सांगली, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-415311
202. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एम. आई. डी. सी. गोकुल शिरगांव,
मु. पो. गोकुल शिरगांव, तालुका, करवीर
जि. कोल्हापुर,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416216
203. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मार्केट यार्ड सांगली शाखा,
प्लॉट नं. 365, वसंत मार्केट यार्ड सांगली,
तालुक मिरज, जि. सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416416.
204. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिवाजी नगर शाखा,
445 अ, देवकर बिल्डिंग, सांगली,
महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416416.
205. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिंपलगांव सरल लेखा शाखा,
पोस्ट-पिंपलगांव, तालुका भुदरगड (गारगोटी),
जि. कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416209.
206. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग राजारामपुरी शाखा,
2021/3 ई वॉर्ड, वर्धमान टेरेसेस,
कोल्हापुर, महाराष्ट्र, पिन नं.-416008.
207. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अभोना शाखा,
अभोना, ता. कलवण, जिला नासिक,
पिन-423502.
208. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
असवली शाखा,
असवली, ता. इगतपुरी,
जिला नासिक, पिन-422402.
209. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चांदवड (चांदोर) शाखा,
पीर चौक, चांदवड,
जिला नासिक, पिन-423105.
210. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सिडको वसाहत (विल्होली) शाखा,
लेखानगर, जिला नासिक,
पिन-422009.
211. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
देवलाळी शाखा,
आनंद मार्ग, देवलाळी,
जिला नासिक, पिन-422401.
212. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धोडांबे शाखा,
पेठ गल्ली, मु. पो. धोडांबे,
ता. चांदवड, जिला नासिक
213. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दिंडोरी शाखा,
कलवण रोड,
जिला नासिक, पिन-422202.
214. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दुगांव शाखा,
ता. चांदवड, जिला नासिक,
पिन-423104.

215. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गंगापुर रोड शाखा,
मोती विला, एस.टी. कॉलोनी,
गंगापुर रोड,
जिला नासिक,
पिन-422005
216. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
इगतपुरी शाखा,
महात्मा गांधी रोड,
इगतपुरी, जिला नासिक,
पिन-422403
217. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कलवन शाखा,
गणेश नगर, मु.पो. कलवन,
ता. कलवन,
जिला नासिक
218. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लासलगांव शाखा,
स्टेशन रोड, लासलगांव,
जिला नासिक,
पिन-422306
219. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मालेगांव शाखा,
कैम्प रोड, ता. माले गांव,
जिला नासिक,
पिन-622203
220. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मनमाड शाखा,
अब्दुल हमीद रोड, मनमाड,
जिला नासिक,
पिन-423104
221. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नांदगाव शाखा,
तहसील नांदगांव,
जिला नासिक,
पिन-423106
222. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नासिक रोड शाखा,
राजहंस बिल्डिंग,
शास्त्री पथ,
नासिक रोड, जिला नासिक,
पिन-42201
223. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
निफाड शाखा, निफाड,
जिला नासिक,
पिन- 422303
224. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ओझर शाखा,
एच.ए.एल. वसाहत, ओझर,
ता. निफाड, जिला नासिक,
पिन-422207
225. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पंचवटी (नासिक) शाखा,
लक्ष्मी-विजय बिल्डिंग,
पेठ नाका, जिला नासिक,
पिन-422003
226. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पेईन्ट (पेठ) शाखा,
उत्तम कॉम्पलेक्स,
बलसाड रोड, मु.पो. पेठ,
जिला नासिक
227. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिपलगांव (बसवंत) शाखा,
ता. निफाड, जिला नासिक,
पिन-422209
228. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिपलनारे सरल लेखा शाखा,
तहसील दिंडोरी, जिला नासिक,
महाराष्ट्र
229. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सटाणा (बागलान) शाखा,
सटाणा (बागलान),
जिला नासिक,
पिन-423301
230. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिवरे सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु.पो. शिवरे, ता. चांदवड,
जिला नासिक,
पिन-423215
231. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सिन्नर शाखा,
एस.टी. स्टैंड के सामने,
सिन्नर, जिला नासिक,
पिन-422103
232. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नासिक ट्रेजरी शाखा,
जिलाधिकारी, कार्यालय कम्पाउन्ड, नासिक,
पिन- 422002
233. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
त्रिबकेश्वर शाखा,
मेन रोड, त्रिबकेश्वर,
जिला नासिक, महाराष्ट्र

234. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाडीवे सरल लेखा शाखा,
वाडीवे, तहसील इगतपुरी,
जिला : नासिक, महाराष्ट्र
235. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
येवला शाखा,
येवला, जिला : नासिक,
पिन-423 401
236. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
झोडगे शाखा,
मु. पो. झोडगे, ता. मालेगांव,
जिला नासिक, महाराष्ट्र
237. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बी ई जी खडकी (पुणे) शाखा,
पत्र पेटी क्र. 13, खडकी,
जिला : पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-411 003
238. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भोर शाखा, मंगलवार पेठ,
राजवाहा चौक, भोर,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-412 206
239. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चाकण शाखा, तालुका-खेड,
पत्र पेटी क्र. 3,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-410 501
240. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चांदखेड सरल लेखा शाखा,
तालुका - मावल, जिला : पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-410 506
241. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चिंचवड शाखा, पत्र पेटी क्र. 20,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 019
242. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दत्तवाडी (पुणे) शाखा,
सूर्य प्लाजा, 214 नवी पेठ,
लाल बहादुर शास्त्री मार्ग,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 030
243. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कात्रज शाखा,
भारतीय विद्यापीठ के नजदीक,
पुणे-सातारा मार्ग, कात्रज, पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-411 046
244. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
खडकी शाखा,
3-अर्जुन मार्ग,
पुणे-411 003
245. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
करकुंभ शाखा,
एम. आय. डी. सी. करकुंभ दौंड,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-413 105
246. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लोनवला शाखा,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-413 101
247. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एम.आय. डी.सी. शाखा, बारामती,
भिंगवण रोड, बारामती,
महाराष्ट्र-413 102
248. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हडपसर शाखा,
कांचनगंगा अपार्टमेंट,
पुणे सोलापूर मार्ग,
पत्र पेटी क्र. 1,
पुणे-411 028
249. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हिंगणे (खुर्द) शाखा,
ऋषिकेतू सिंहगड रोड, हिंगणखुर्द,
पुणे-411 051
250. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आय. ए.टी. गिरीनगर शाखा,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411025
251. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आय.एन.एस. शिवाजी (लोनवला) शाखा,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-410 402
252. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धनकवडी, (पुणे) शाखा,
बालाजीनगर, कॉर्नर, एलोरा पॅलेस,
पुणे-सातारा मार्ग,
पुणे, 411 043
253. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गोलीबार मैदान शाखा,
शंकरशेठ रौंड, पुणे-411 001
254. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एच.डी.एफ.सी. कॉम्प्लेक्स चिंचवड शाखा,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 019
255. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एन.सी.एल. कैम्पस (पुणे) शाखा,
पापाण रोड, पुणे-411.008
256. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एन.डी.ए. खडकवासला शाखा,
पुणे-411 023 (महाराष्ट्र)

257. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पौड रोड (पुणे) शाखा,
आनंदनगर के सामने,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 038
258. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा,
सेनापती बापट मार्ग (पुणे),
पुणे-411 016
259. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिंपरी शाखा,
पत्र पेटी क्र. 1, कासारवाडी पोस्ट,
पुणे-411 034
260. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिंपरी दाऊन शाखा,
डॉ. आंबेडकर रोड, पिंपरी कालोनी,
पुणे-411 017
261. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दौण्ड शाखा,
जिला : पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-413 801
262. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
देहू रोड शाखा,
रेलवे स्टेशन के नजदीक, पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-412 101
263. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिरूर (घोडनदी) शाखा,
जिला : पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-412 210
264. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बण्डगाडन शाखा,
डुंगरसी मार्क, 22, बंड रोड,
पुणे-411 001.
265. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मार्केट यार्ड (पुणे) शाखा,
गुलटेकडी,
पुणे-411 037.
266. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पुलगेट शाखा,
पंचरत्न अपार्टमेंट्स,
पुणे-411 013
267. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ट्रेजरी शाखा (पुणे),
पत्र पेटी, क्र. 78,
जिलाधिकारी कार्यालय परिसर,
डॉ. आंबेडकर मार्ग,
पुणे-411 001
268. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पुरंदर (सासवाड) शाखा,
सासवाड, पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-412 301.
269. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लघु उद्योग शाखा (पुणे),
तारा चेंबर्स, मुंबई-पुणे रोड, पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-411 003
270. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डेक्कन जिमखाना शाखा,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 004
271. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
औंध (पुणे) शाखा,
प्लॉट क्र. 6, सानेवाडी,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 007
272. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृषि विकास शाखा (इंद्रापुर),
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-413 106.
273. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ऊरुली कांचन शाखा,
"गंगा वैभव", आश्रम रोड, ता. हवेली,
पुणे-412 202
274. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृषि विकास शाखा, जुन्नर,
जिला-पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-410 502
275. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विद्यापीठ रोड शाखा (पुणे),
वीर चाफेकर चौक,
पुणे-411 016.
276. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आलंदी शाखा,
मेन रोड, तालुका-खेड,
जिला-पुणे, पिन क्र. : 412 105
277. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अंबावणे स. ले. शाखा,
अंबावणे, ता. वेल्हे,
जिला - पुणे
278. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बारामती शाखा,
जिला-पुणे,
पिन क्र. : 423 102
279. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पुणे शहर शाखा,
विजय चेंबर्स, 1379, सदाशिव पेठ,
भरतनाट्य मंदिर के सामने,
पुणे, महाराष्ट्र-411 030

280. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मंचर शाखा,
एस टी स्टैंड के पास, पुणे नासिक रोड,
ता. अंबेगाव, पिन क्र. : 410503
281. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
राजगुरुनगर शाखा,
तालुका-खेड,
जिला-पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-410505
282. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विशिष्ट वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग बंड गार्डन (पुणे) शाखा,
बंडगार्डन प्रेस बिल्डिंग, ठोले पाटील रोड,
पुणे-411001
283. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक
इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट लोनावला शाखा,
नागरगांव, लोनावला,
जिला-पुणे-410401
284. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आंचलिक कार्यालय, पुणे,
"गुलमोहोर"
2420, ईस्ट स्ट्रीट कैप,
पुणे-411001
285. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सेवा शाखा, पुणे,
भाऊसाहेब शिरोले भवन,
पीएमटी बिल्डिंग, 5वां माला,
डेक्कन जिमखाना,
पुणे-411004
286. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एसपीजीबी, डेक्कन जिमखाना, पुणे,
कुमार रेनेसांस,
डेक्कन जिमखाना, पुणे-411004
287. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डेक्कन जिमखाना शाखा,
डेक्कन जिमखाना, पुणे-411004
288. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, एरंडवणा शाखा, पुणे,
एसएनडीटी कॉलेज के सामने,
कर्वे रोड,
पुणे-411004
289. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नासिक शाखा,
जुना आग्रा रोड,
नासिक, महाराष्ट्र-422002
290. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तिलक रोड शाखा, पुणे,
- कर्मशियल बिल्डिंग,
तिलक रोड, पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-411002
291. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पुणे मुख्य शाखा, पुणे,
पो. बाक्स नं. 06
कलेक्टर ऑफिस कम्पाउंड,
पुणे-411001
292. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ईस्ट स्ट्रीट शाखा, पुणे,
2420, गुलमोहोर बिल्डिंग,
ईस्ट स्ट्रीट, पुणे-411001
293. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बान्द्रा कुर्ला कॉम्प्लेक्स शाखा,
प्लॉट क्र. सी-6, जी-ब्लॉक,
बान्द्रा-कुर्ला कॉम्प्लेक्स,
मुंबई-00051
294. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आंचलिक कार्यालय, नागपुर,
सरदार वल्लभभाई पटेल मार्ग,
पत्र पेटी क्र. 37,
नागपुर-440001
295. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दीनदयालनगर शाखा,
त्रिमूर्तिनगर, नागपुर-440022
296. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृ.वि. शाखा साकोली,
साकोली, जिला-भंडारा,
महाराष्ट्र
297. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जवाहर नगर आयुध निर्माणी शाखा,
जवाहरनगर, ता. एवं जिला-भंडारा,
महाराष्ट्र
298. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भंडारा शाखा,
कृष्णपुरा वार्ड, मेन रोड,
भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र
299. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गोबरवाही शाखा,
ता. तुमसर, जिला-भंडारा,
महाराष्ट्र
300. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तुमसर, शाखा,
तुमसर, जिला-भंडारा,
महाराष्ट्र

301. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वायुसेनानगर शाखा,
मुख्य अनुरक्षण कमान, वायुसेना,
वायुसेना नगर, नागपुर
302. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जयप्रकाश नगर शाखा,
तपोवन कॉम्प्लेक्स,
जयप्रकाश नगर, नागपुर
303. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सिमेट नगर शाखा,
डाकघर-सिमेट नगर,
ता. एवं जिला-चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र
304. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गडचिरोली शाखा,
मधुमंदाकिनी बिल्डिंग,
मूल रोड, गडचिरोली,
महाराष्ट्र
305. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कामठी शाखा,
जबलपुर रोड, कामठी,
जिला-नागपुर
306. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नरखेड शाखा,
नरखेड, जिला-नागपुर
307. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कोराडी शाखा,
कामठी रोड, कोराडी,
जिला-नागपुर
308. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बल्लारपुर शाखा,
कछेला कॉम्प्लेक्स, बस स्थानक के सामने,
बल्लारपुर,
जिला चंद्रपुर, महाराष्ट्र 444701
309. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बूटी बोरी एम आय डी सी शाखा,
प्लॉट नं. 19, एम.आय.डी.सी.,
पुलिस थाने के सामने, बूटी बोरी,
जिला-नागपुर,
महाराष्ट्र 441108
310. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हिरडव स.ले. शाखा,
हिरडव, ता. लोणार,
जिला-बुलडाणा, महाराष्ट्र
311. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
किनगांव जट्टू स.ले. शाखा,
डाकघर-किनगांव जट्टू,
ता. लोणार, जिला-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
312. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
डोणगांव शाखा,
ता. मेहकर, जिला-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
313. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
उंद्री शाखा, उंद्री,
ता. चिखली, जिला-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
314. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शेंदला शाखा,
डाकघर-नायगांव दत्तापुर,
ता. मेहकर, जिला-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र 443301
315. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मलकापुर शाखा,
बुलडाणा मार्ग मलकापुर,
जिला-बुलडाणा, महाराष्ट्र
316. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चिखली शाखा,
शिवाजी पुतले के नजदीक,
खामगांव रोड चिखली,
जिला-बुलडाणा
महाराष्ट्र
317. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बुलडाणा शाखा,
चिखली रोड,
बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
318. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मंगरुलपीर शाखा,
महसील-मंगरुलपीर,
जिला-वाशिम, महाराष्ट्र
319. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुर्तिजापुर शाखा,
जिला-अकोला,
महाराष्ट्र 444107
320. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कामरगांव शाखा,
तहसील-कारंजा (लाड),
जिला-वाशिम, महाराष्ट्र

321. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
महान शाखा,
महान, ता. बार्शी टाकली,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
322. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तिवसा शाखा,
तहसील-तिवसा,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
323. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दस्तुरनगर शाखा,
दस्तुरनगर, अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
324. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कुर्हा शाखा,
तहसील-तिवसा जिला अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
325. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मोर्शी शाखा,
मोर्शी, जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
326. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तलेगांव (दशासर) शाखा,
तहसील-धामनगांव रेल्वे,
जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
327. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मंगरुल चवाला स. ले. शाखा,
तहसील-नांदगांव खंडेश्वर,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444 729
328. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
आमला स.ले. शाखा,
वाया खालापुर तहसील-दर्यापुर,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444802
329. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
घुईखेंड स.ले. शाखा,
तहसील-चांदूर रेल्वे,
जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
330. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चांदूर रेल्वे शाखा,
चांदूर रेल्वे, जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
331. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धामनगांव रेल्वे कृ.वि. शाखा,
भगतसिंह चौक, धामनगांव रेल्वे,
जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
332. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अचलपुर शाखा,
सिविल लार्ड्स परतवाडा,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444 085
333. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अमरावती कैप शाखा,
तपोवन रोड, अमरावती कैप,
अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
334. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तलेगांव (ठाकुर) शाखा,
तहसील-तिवसा,
जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
335. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सेमाडोह स.ले. शाखा,
तहसील-चिखलदरा,
जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
336. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अंजनसिंगी शाखा,
अंजनसिंगी, जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
337. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वलागांव शाखा,
वलागांव, जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
338. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पलसखेड स.ले. शाखा,
तहसील-चांदूर रेल्वे,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444904
339. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धामक स.ले. शाखा,
तहसील-नांदगांव खंडेश्वर,
जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
340. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रामतीर्थ स.ले. शाखा,
तहसील-दर्यापुर,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444802
341. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धारणी शाखा,
मेन रोड, धारणी,
जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444702
342. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हिंमनघाट शाखा, जिला-वर्धा,
महाराष्ट्र 442301

343. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गिरोली (इगले) शाखा,
तहसील-देवली,
जिला-वर्धा, महाराष्ट्र
344. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चिखली (भाडेगांव) शाखा,
तहसील-दारुवा,
जिला-यवतभाल, महाराष्ट्र
345. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दिग्रस शाखा,
शिवाजी नगर, टाउन हाल के सामने, दिग्रस,
जिला-यवतभाल, महाराष्ट्र
346. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
हरसुल शाखा,
हरसुल, तहसील-दिग्रस,
जिला-यवतभाल, महाराष्ट्र
347. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
निंभा स.ले. शाखा,
निंभा, तहसील-समुद्रपुर,
जिला-वर्धा, महाराष्ट्र
348. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृ. वि. शाखा अमरावती,
मालवीय चौक, पुराना कॉर्टन बाजार,
अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
349. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृ.वि. शाखा अचलपुर,
द्वारा वैद्य भवन,
परतवाडा, जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444805
350. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चांदूर बाजार शाखा,
चांदूर बाजार, जिला-अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र
351. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अमरावती मुख्य शाखा,
महर्षि दयानंद सरस्वती मार्ग,
श्याम चौक, अमरावती,
महाराष्ट्र 444601
352. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दर्यापुर शाखा,
दर्यापुर, जिला-अमरावती, महाराष्ट्र
353. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सरल लेखा शाखा केनवड
केनवड, तहसील-मालेगांव,
जिला-वाशिम, महाराष्ट्र
354. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ट्रेजरी शाखा आकेला,
शास्त्रीनगर,
अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
355. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मानोरा शाखा,
मानोरा, जिला-वाशिम
महाराष्ट्र
356. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अकोला पुरानी बस्ती शाखा,
जयहिंद चौक के पास,
पुरानी बस्ती, अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
357. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृषि विकास शाखा बालापुर,
गुणी चावडी, बालापुर,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
358. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पारस शाखा,
विद्युतनगर पारस, ता. बालापुर,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र 444109
359. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सस्ती स. ले. शाखा,
सस्ती, ता.-पातुर,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र 444501
360. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रिसोड शाखा,
डाकघर एवं ता. रिसोड,
जिला-वाशिम, महाराष्ट्र
361. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गांधी ग्रेन मार्केट शाखा,
पुराना बगडगंज टेलीफोन
एक्सचेंज चौक, सेंट्रल एबन्यू,
नागपुर
362. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा, वर्धमान नगर,
230, जिगर पॅलेस, वर्धमाननगर (पूर्व),
नागपुर-440008
363. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वैयक्तिक बैंकिंग शाखा, रामदास पेठ,
थापर एंक्लेव, यूनिवर्सिटी रोड,
रामदासपेठ, नागपुर
364. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दुसरबीड स. ले. शाखा,
ता.-सिंदरखेड राजा,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र-443308

365. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृषि विकास शाखा बीबी,
बीबी, ता. लोनार,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र-443209
366. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शेगांव शाखा,
शेगांव, जिला-बुलढाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
367. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अमडापुर शाखा,
अमडापुर, ता. चिखली,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
368. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अकोला, कृ.वि. शाखा,
जठारपेठ, अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
369. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अकोट, कृ.वि. शाखा,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
370. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मालेगांव शाखा,
मालेगांव, जिला-वाशिम, महाराष्ट्र
371. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बार्शी टाकली शाखा,
बोबडे निवास, बार्शी टाकली
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
372. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अकोली जहागीर शाखा,
अकोला, ता.-अकोट,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
373. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बालापुर शाखा,
गुजरातीपुरा, बालापुर,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र-444 302
374. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
व्याला स.ले. शाखा,
व्याला, ता.-बालापुर,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
375. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धाबा स.ले. शाखा,
धाबा, ता. बार्शी टाकली,
जिला-अकोला, महाराष्ट्र-444 001
376. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कारंजा शाखा,
मुलजी जेठा विद्यालय के पास,
कारंजा, जिला-वाशिम, महाराष्ट्र
377. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुख्य शाखा अकोला,
जवाहरलाल नेहरू मार्ग, अकोला
महाराष्ट्र
378. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रामदासपेठ शाखा अकोला,
ओल्डमिलार्ड रोड,
रामदासपेठ, अकोला, महाराष्ट्र
379. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
देउरवाडा रोड, आर्षी शाखा,
जिला-वर्धा, महाराष्ट्र
380. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वणी शाखा,
वणी, जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र-445 304
381. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शिंदोला, ता.-वणी,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र-444 307
382. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नायगांव, सरल लेख शाखा
नायगांव, ता.-वणी,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र
383. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कायर, स. ले. शाखा,
कायर, ता.-वणी,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र-445304
384. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुकटबन शाखा,
मुकटबन, ता.-झरी,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र
385. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पाटणबोरी शाखा,
पाटणबोरी, ता.-केलापुर,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र
386. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पांढरकवडा शाखा,
पांढरकवडा, ता.-केलापुर,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र
387. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सावरखेड शाखा,
सावरखेड, ता.-रालेगांव,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र
388. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सारवाडी शाखा,
सारवाडी, ता.-कारंजा,
जिला-वर्धा, महाराष्ट्र

389. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
ढाणकी शाखा,
ढाणकी, ता.-उमरखेड,
जिला-यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र
390. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पुसद शाखा,
पुसद, जिला-यवतमाल,
महाराष्ट्र
391. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाढोणा शाखा,
वाढोणा, ता.-आर्वी,
जिला-वर्धा, महाराष्ट्र
392. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
दत्त चौक यवतमाल शाखा,
संकटमोचन मार्ग,
यवतमाल, महाराष्ट्र-445 101
393. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गोपालनगर शाखा, (नागपुर)
जगदीश सभागृह, राणाप्रताप रोड,
नागपुर-440 022
394. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नीरी शाखा, (नागपुर),
राष्ट्रीय पर्यावरण आभियांत्रिकी
अनुसंधान संस्थान,
जवाहर रोड,
नागपुर-440 022
395. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
अंबाझरी शाखा, (नागपुर),
प्लॉट क. 373,
उत्तर अंबाझरी रोड,
गांधीनगर, नागपुर- 440 010
396. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रविनगर शाखा, (नागपुर)
अन्नपूर्णा आरकेड,
अग्रसेन छात्रावास के सामने
अमरावती रोड, रविनगर
नागपुर-440 022
397. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
छात्रनगर शाखा, (नागपुर)
खंडवाती चेंबर, अंबेडकर चौक,
सेंट्रल एवेन्यू रोड,
नागपुर
398. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रेल ट्रेली शाखा,
रेल ट्रेली, गोदिया,
महाराष्ट्र
399. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृषि विकास शाखा आमगांव,
आमगांव, जिला-गोदिया,
महाराष्ट्र
400. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शेलसुर शाखा,
शेलसुर, ता. चिखली,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
401. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
केलवद शाखा,
विट्ठल निवास, केलवद,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
402. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कृषि विकास शाखा, मेहकर
सोमण जीन के सामने,
मेहकर, जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
403. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धामणगांव बढे शाखा,
धामणगांव बढे, ता. मोताला,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
404. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जानेफल शाखा,
जानेफल, ता. मेहकर,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
405. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लाखनवाडा शाखा,
लाखनवाडा, ता. खामगांव,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
406. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
खामगांव शाखा,
अनुपम फरशी मार्ग,
खामगांव, जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
407. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिंपलगांव राजा शाखा,
पिंपलगांव राजा, ता. खामगांव,
जिला-बुलढाणा, महाराष्ट्र
408. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नागपुर मुख्य शाखा,
पत्र पेटी कं. 37,
सरदार वल्लभभाई पटेल मार्ग,
नागपुर-440 001
409. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सेवा शाखा, (नागपुर),
5वीं मंजिल, श्री मोहिनी कॉम्प्लेक्स,
एस.वी. पटेल मार्ग,
नागपुर-440 001

410. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मेडिकल कॉलेज एरिया शाखा,
नागपुर-440 009
411. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
छावनी शाखा,
नागपुर-440 013
412. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पाचपावली शाखा,
केशव भवन, कामटी रोड,
नागपुर-440 004
413. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
इतवारी शाखा,
इतवारी, नागपुर-440 002
414. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
महल शाखा,
गांधीसागर, महल,
नागपुर- 440 032
415. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सेन्ट्रल एवेन्यू रोड शाखा,
सेन्ट्रल एवेन्यू रोड,
नागपुर-440 018
416. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धरमपेठ शाखा,
वेस्ट हाईकोर्ट रोड,
नागपुर-440 010
417. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रामदासपेठ शाखा,
पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू मार्ग,
वर्धा रोड, नागपुर- 440 012
418. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सुरेन्द्रनगर शाखा,
प्लॉट नं. 244, सुरेन्द्रनगर,
नागपुर
419. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कोल इस्टेट शाखा,
सेमीनरी हिल्स,
नागपुर
420. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वि.आर.सी.ई. शाखा,
उत्तर अंबाझरी मार्ग,
नागपुर
421. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जांब शाखा,
पो. जांब, ता. तुमसर,
जि.-भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र.
422. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एकोडी सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु.पो., एकोडी,
ता. साकोली,
जि.-भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र
423. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सानगडी शाखा,
मु. पो.-सानगडी, ता. साकोली,
जि.-भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र 441 808
424. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कोका सरल लेखा शाखा,
कोका, ता. एवं जि. भंडारा,
महाराष्ट्र
425. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
साकोली शाखा,
जि.-भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र
426. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पारडसिंगा शाखा,
मु.पो.-पारडसिंगा, ता.-काटोल,
जि.-नागपुर, महाराष्ट्र-441305
427. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लखमापुर सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु.पो.-लखमापुर,
ता.कोरपना, जि.-चंद्रपूर,
महाराष्ट्र
428. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वरोरा शाखा,
पो.-वरोरा, जि.-चंद्रपूर,
महाराष्ट्र
429. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वडसा शाखा,
पो.-वडसा,
जि.-गडचिरोली, महाराष्ट्र
430. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तलोधी बालापूर शाखा,
पो.-तलोधी बालापूर
ता.-नागभीड, जि.-चंद्रपूर,
महाराष्ट्र
431. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
काटोल शाखा,
नेहरू बाजार, काटोल,
महाराष्ट्र
432. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
उमरेड शाखा,
मु.पो./ता.-उमरेड,
जि.-नागपुर-441 203

433. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
राजोला सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु. पो.-राजोला, ता. कुही,
जि.-नागपुर-441 202
434. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चाफेगडी सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु. पो.-चाफेगडी,
ता. कुही, जि.-नागपुर-441 202
435. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गोंदिया मुख्य शाखा,
अग्रसेन भवन के पास
गोंदिया, महाराष्ट्र
436. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
थडीपवनी शाखा,
मु.पो.-थडीपवनी, ता.-नरखेड,
जि.-नागपुर
437. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
बालापुर सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु.पो.-बालापुर,
ता. नागभिड,
जि.-चंद्रपुर, महाराष्ट्र
438. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कन्हान खंडेलवाल नगर शाखा,
जे. एन्. रोड कन्हान,
जि. नागपुर
439. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चातगांव शाखा,
मु.पो.-चातगांव,
ता. धातोरा, -गड़चिरोली,
महाराष्ट्र
440. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मेंडकी शाखा,
मु.पो.-मेंडकी
ता.-ब्रह्मपुरी, जि.-चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र
441. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चंद्रपुर मुख्य शाखा,
कस्तुरबा रोड,
चंद्रपुर, महाराष्ट्र-442402
442. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
वाढोणा सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु.पो.-वाढोणा,
ता. नागभिड,
जि.-चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र
443. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
फॉरेस्ट कैप एमआईडीसी शाखा,
धुगुस रोड,
चंद्रपुर, महाराष्ट्र
444. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मौदा शाखा,
मु.पो.-मौदा,
जि. नागपुर
445. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
कुरखेडा शाखा,
मु.पो.-कुरखेडा
ता.-कुरखेडा,
जि.-गड़चिरोली,
महाराष्ट्र
446. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
गडचांदुर शाखा,
मु.पो.-गडचांदुर
ता.-कोरपना, जि.-चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र
447. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
एटापल्ली शाखा,
मु.पो.-एटापल्ली,
जि.-गड़चिरोली,
महाराष्ट्र
448. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सावरी बिडकर सरल लेखा शाखा,
मु.पो.-सावरी बिडकर,
ता.-वरोरा, जि.-चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र-442 906
449. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
भद्रावती ऑर्डिनेन्स फैक्टरी शाखा,
मु.पो.-भद्रावती,
जि.-चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र
450. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
रामटेक शाखा,
गांधी चौक, रामटेक,
महाराष्ट्र
451. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
शास्त्रीनगर शाखा,
गुलशन पॅलेस,
मूल रोड,
शास्त्री नगर,
चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र-442 401

452. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट शाखा,
पत्तीवार बिल्डिंग,
जुना वरोरा नाका,
सिविल लाईन्स,
चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र-442 401
453. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
चंद्रपुर शाखा,
डॉ खान भवन,
रामनगर, चंद्रपुर,
महाराष्ट्र-442 401
454. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जलगांव जामोद कृ.वि.शा.,
जलगांव जामोद,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
455. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
जलगांव जामोद शाखा,
पो.-जलगांव जामोद,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र-443402
456. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
सोनाला शाखा,
सोनाला, ता. संग्रामपुर,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
457. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
फोफली सरल लेखा शाखा
फाफली, ता. मोताला
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
458. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
धाड शाखा
धाड, जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
459. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मलकापुर कृ.वि.शाखा,
मलकापुर, जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
460. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लोणार शाखा,
ता.-लोणार, मेहकर रोड,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र-443302
461. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मेहकर शाखा, मेहकर,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र-225789
462. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पलसी शाखा,
पलसी, ता.-खामगांव,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
463. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
खामगांव कृ.वि. शाखा,
खामगांव,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
464. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
साखरखेडा शाखा,
साखरखेडा,
ता.-सिंदखेडराजा,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
465. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पिंपलगांव देवी स.ले. शाखा,
पिंपलगांव देवी,
ता.-मोताला,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
466. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मोताला शाखा, मोताला,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
467. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
नांदुरा शाखा, नांदुरा,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
468. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मलकापुर पांग्रा शाखा,
पो./ता.-सिंदखेडराजा,
जि.-बुलडाणा,
महाराष्ट्र
469. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
तिरोडा शाखा,
लाला चौक,
मेन रोड, तिरोडा,
जि.-गोंदिया,
महाराष्ट्र

470. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
पवनी शाखा,
सोमवारी वार्ड, पवनी,
जिला भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र

471. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
मुन्दी स.ले. शाखा,
पोस्ट मुन्दी, ता. मोहाडी,
जिला भंडारा, महाराष्ट्र

472. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
लघु उद्योग व्यवसाय शाखा,
संजय प्लेस, आगरा,
उत्तर प्रदेश-282002

473. भारतीय स्टेट बैंक,
विशेषीकृत लघु उद्योग शाखा,
समद रोड, अलीगढ़,
उत्तर प्रदेश-202001

विजया बैंक

प्रधान कार्यालय

राजभाषा प्रभाग

बेंगलूर

1. विजया बैंक,
एच.एस.आर. लेआऊट,
बंगलूर-1405 (म),
सं. 7, 17वां क्रॉस,
सेक्टर सं. 7,
एच.एस.आर. लेआऊट,
बंगलूर-560034
कर्नाटक राज्य

2. विजया बैंक,
बी.टी.एम. लेआऊट-1406 (म),
सं. 23, शिक्षा आर्केड,
29वीं मेडन, I स्टेज,
बी.टी.एम. लेआऊट,
बंगलूर-560078
कर्नाटक राज्य

3. विजया बैंक,
गिरि नगर-1407 (म),
सं. 5, 50 फीट रोड,
आवहल्ली एक्सटेंशन,
गिरि नगर,
बंगलूर-560026
कर्नाटक राज्य

4. विजया बैंक,
ऑक्सफोर्ड स्कूल कैम्पस,
10वां क्रॉस जे.पी. नगर, I फेस,
बंगलूर-560078
कर्नाटक राज्य

5. विजया बैंक,
एमएसआरआईटी, बंगलूर-1412 (म),
एम.एस. रामय्या इंस्टिट्यूट ऑफ टेक्नॉलजी,
गोकुल, मत्तिकेरे,
बंगलूर-560034
कर्नाटक राज्य

6. विजया बैंक,
विद्यारण्यापुरा-1414,
सं. 735/51/2,
नंजप्पा मेडन रोड,
विद्यारण्यापुरा,
बंगलूर-560097
कर्नाटक राज्य

7. विजया बैंक,
दयानंद सागर कॉलेज ऑफ इंजीनियरिंग,
बंगलूर, कुमारस्वामी लेआऊट,
कर्नाटक राज्य-560078

8. विजया बैंक,
तेजपुर-8005 (अ),
पी.बी. सं. 29, मेडन रोड,
तेजपुर-784001, असम

9. विजया बैंक,
सिलचर-8006 (न),
पी.बी. सं. 27, शिल्लांग पट्टी,
श्यामप्रसाद रोड,
सिलचर-788001, असम

10. विजया बैंक,
सिबसागर-8009,
भारती कमर्शियल कंप्लेक्स,
1 तल, हॉस्पिटल रोड,
सिबसागर-785640, असम

11. विजया बैंक,
मलिगांव-8010 (न),
1 तल, कुंजा प्लाजा,
कमर्शियल कंप्लेक्स,
मलिगांव चारियाली मलिगांव,
गुवाहाटी कामरूप जिला,
असम राज्य पिनकोड-781012

12. विजया बैंक,
कोहिमा-8101 (अ),
पी.बी. सं. 20,
सर्कुलर रोड, दीमापुर,
नागालैंड राज्य,
पिनकोड-797112
13. विजया बैंक,
दीमापुर-8102 (अ),
पी.बी. सं. 20,
सर्कुलर रोड, दीमापुर,
नागालैंड राज्य,
पिनकोड-797112
14. विजया बैंक,
नागिनीमोरा-8103 (ग्रा),
मेइन रोड,
नागिनीमोरा मॉन जिला,
नागालैंड राज्य,
पिनकोड-798622
15. विजया बैंक,
जी.एस. रोड, 8501 (न),
पी.बी. सं. 18,
जी.एस. रोड, शिलांग,
मेघालय, पिनकोड-793001
16. विजया बैंक,
लाईतुमुखराह-8502 (अ),
पी.बी. सं. 1,
पोस्ट ऑफिस के पास,
लाईतुमुखराह, शिलांग,
मेघालय, पिनकोड-793003
17. विजया बैंक,
कुकटपल्ली-4083 (न),
प्लॉट सं. सी व डी, जयभारत नगर,
निजामपेट रोड, केपीएचबी कॉलोनी,
रंगारेड्डी जिला,
हैदराबाद-500072
18. विजया बैंक,
जबुली हिल्स-4084 (न),
ए-33, फिल्म नगर, रोड सं. 5,
जबुली हिल्स,
हैदराबाद जिला,
हैदराबाद-500033
19. विजया बैंक,
गांधीनगर-4085,
डी. सं. 1-4-879/42/6/ए/1
सूर्या रेसिडेंसी के सामने बकरम,
हैदराबाद-500080
20. विजया बैंक,
अलुवा-2069 (अ),
मुक्कथ प्लाजा,
बाईपास जंक्शन अलुवा,
केरल राज्य पिनकोड-683101
21. विजया बैंक,
वाईटिल्ला-2070 (न),
सिमसन टावर्स, एस.ए.रोड,
वाईटिल्ला, एर्नाकुलम,
केरल पिनकोड-682019
22. विजया बैंक,
वेल्लायंबलम-2071,
अक्षय टावर्स, टीसी-9-1494,
संस्थमंगलम जंक्शन,
तिरुवनंतपुरम,
केरल पिनकोड-695010
23. विजया बैंक,
मुद्रा पेटिका कुंडोटी-9616,
आरएस/83/3 नेडियूरप्पु ग्राम,
कुंडोटी मालप्पुरम जिला,
केरल
24. विजया बैंक,
मुद्रा पेटिका तिरुवल्ला-9620,
वेंगल बिल्डिंग, क्रॉस जंक्शन,
तिरुवल्ला-689101
25. विजया बैंक,
सुब्रह्मण्या-1409 (ग्रा) पोस्ट
सुब्रह्मण्या, सूल्लिया ताल्लुक द.क. जिला,
कर्नाटक राज्य पिनकोड-574238
26. विजया बैंक,
भोगदी, मैसूर-1413,
सं. 1545, साहुकार चेन्नय्या रोड,
भोगदी, 2 स्टेज,
मैसूर, कर्नाटक
27. विजया बैंक,
विजय नगर-1415,
न्यू कालिदास रोड,
विजयनगर । स्टेज,
मैसूर-570017
28. विजया बैंक,
मुद्रा पेटिका शिमोगा-9615,
'हर्षा आर्केड'
शरावती नगर,
सागर रोड, शिमोगा-577201
29. विजया बैंक,
मुद्रा पेटिका उडुपि-9618,
'विष्णु प्रिया'
एलबीएस मार्ग, अज्जरक्काड,
उडुपि-576101, द.क.

30. विजया बैंक,
कुंभासी-1408 (ग्रा),
सं. 1/34, एन.एच. 17,
आनेगुड्ड, कुंभासी,
कुंदापुर ताल्लुक,
उडुपि जिला,
कर्नाटक पिनकोड-576257
31. विजया बैंक,
बेंज सर्कल, विजयवाडा-40800 (न),
डी. सं. 40-1/52/6,
बेंज सर्कल के पास,
एम.जी. रोड, विजयवाडा,
आंध्र प्रदेश पिनकोड-520010
32. विजया बैंक,
द्वारका नगर-4082,
पवन टावर्स, द्वारका नगर,
विशाखापट्टनम-530016
33. विजया बैंक,
चिराल-4081,
मकान सं. 14-1-148(2),
विपिन विल्ला,
मुनिसिपल कार्यालय रोड,
चिराल-523155,
प्रकाशम जिला, आ. प्र.
34. विजया बैंक,
सिलिगुरी-7207 (न),
भू-तला नानक सेवक रोड,
सिलिगुरी, पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-734401
35. विजया बैंक,
धर्मतोल्ला-7211 (म),
सं. 37/1, एन. सी. स्ट्रीट,
धर्मतोल्ला, कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700013
36. विजया बैंक,
ब्राबोर्न रोड, -7213 (म),
पी.बी. सं. 2038,
1/2, ओल्ड कोर्ट हाऊस,
ब्राबोर्न रोड, कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700001
37. विजया बैंक,
जगन्नाथपुर-7215 (ग्रा),
जगन्नाथपुर बारसात,
पहला तल, नार्थ 24, परगणास जिला,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-743201
38. विजया बैंक,
ओवरसीज, कोलकाता,
पहला तल, ए.जी. टावर्स,
125/1, पार्क स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700017
39. विजया बैंक,
एन.एस. रोड (न्यू)-7218 (म),
पहला तल, मुक्ति चबर्स,
सं. 4, क्लाइव रो एन.एस. रोड,
कोलकाता पिनकोड-700001
40. विजया बैंक,
गोरा बाजार-7221 (अ),
95, डॉ. एस.पी. मुखर्जी रोड,
गोरा बाजार, दम दम छावनी,
कोलकाता, पश्चिम बंगाल,
पिनकोड-700028
41. विजया बैंक,
राशबिहारी एवेन्यू-7222 (म)
पहला तल सं. 175,
सरत बोस रोड, कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700026
42. विजया बैंक,
श्याम बाजार-7223 (म),
54/ए, पहला तल,
भूपेन बोस एवेन्यू,
श्याम बाजार कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700004
43. विजया बैंक,
सीअलदाह-7224 (म),
53-एबीसी, टावर प्लाजा,
सूर्य संत स्ट्रीट,
मित्र हाई स्कूल के पास,
सीअलदाह, कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700009
44. विजया बैंक,
साल्ट लेक, कोलकाता-7226 (न),
डीए 31, सेक्टर-1,
साल्ट लेक, कोलकाता,
पश्चिम बंगाल पिनकोड-700064
45. विजया बैंक,
न्यू मार्केट-7227,
सं. 53-डी, मिर्जा गालिब स्ट्रीट,
न्यू मार्केट, कोलकाता-700016
46. विजया बैंक,
बरहमपुर-7402 (न),
सं. 142, हनुमान बाजार रोड,
बरहमपुर, गजाम जिला,
उड़ीसा पिनकोड-760002

47. विजया बैंक,
संबलपुर-7406 (न),
इंदसर कॉम्प्लेक्स,
बी.एस.एस. मार्ग,
साखी गोपीनाथ, संबलपुर,
उड़ीसा पिनकोड-760001
48. विजया बैंक,
हरिद्वार-7142,
8, गोविंदपुरी मेइन रोड,
चंद्राचार्य चौक के पास,
हरिद्वार-249401
उत्तरांचल राज्य
49. विजया बैंक,
डीएलएफ फेज-1, गुडगांव-8313(म)
शॉप सं. 19-20, शॉपिंग मॉल,
डीएलएफ सिटी फेज-1,
अर्जुन मार्ग, डीएलएफ, गुडगांव,
हरियाणा-122002
50. विजया बैंक,
अंबाला छावनी-8311(अ),
6261-63, क्रॉस सं. 2, निकलसन रोड,
बी.डी. स्कूल के पीछे,
अंबाला छावनी, हरियाणा,
पिनकोड-133001
51. विजया बैंक,
सोनीपत-8312 (न),
41-44, सुभाष चौक,
म्युनिसिपल मार्केट एटलस रोड,
सोनीपत, हरियाणा-131001
52. विजया बैंक,
विकास मार्ग-6041(म) सं. 8,
राजधानी एन्कलेव, विकास मार्ग,
नई दिल्ली-110092
53. विजया बैंक
मालवीय नगर-6042(म),
डी-86, मेइन रोड,
मालवीय नगर, नई दिल्ली-110017
54. विजया बैंक,
आजादपुर-6043 (म),
17-18, न्यू सब्जी मंडी,
इंद्रप्रस्थ आइस व कोल्ड स्टोरेज के पीछे,
अजादपुर, दिल्ली-110033
55. विजया बैंक,
विद्याधर नगर-7013(म),
बी-5, धनश्री-, सेंट्रल लाइन,
विद्याधर नगर, जयपुर,
राजस्थान-302012
56. विजया बैंक,
सिटी पैलेस-7014(न),
सिटी पैलेस, उदयपुर,
राजस्थान-313001
57. विजया बैंक,
ग्रेटर नोएडा-7140,
शॉप सं. 7, 8, 9, जगत फार्म सेक्टर,
गामा-सी, ग्रेटर नोएडा-201308,
गौतम बुद्ध नगर जिला, उ.प्र.
58. विजया बैंक,
कोटा-7016
प्लॉट सं. 3, एयरड्रॉम सर्कल,
कोटा, राजस्थान
59. विजया बैंक
अल्वर गेट-7018(न)
43, विजया कॉम्प्लेक्स,
लाजपत नगर, जय मार्ग, अल्वर,
राजस्थान-301001
60. विजया बैंक
एस.एस. रोड, इंदौर-7607(म)
सं. 32, स्नेह नगर,
मेन सपना संगीत रोड, इंदौर,
मध्य प्रदेश-452001
61. विजया बैंक,
आई.ई.टी. मोहिबुल्लापुर-7141(न),
दि इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ इंजीनियरिंग व तकनॉलजी,
सीतापुर रोड, मोहिबुल्लापुर,
लखनऊ जिला, उ.प्र.
62. विजया बैंक,
उन्नाव-7413,
309-320 (न्यू), मोहल्ला सहगंज,
उन्नाव-209801 उ.प्र.
63. विजया बैंक
मथुरा-7144,
तेरा टॉवर, भूतेश्वर रोड,
मथुरा-281001,
उत्तर प्रदेश
64. विजया बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय
चंडीगढ़-9126,
एससीओ-185-187, सेक्टर 9 सी,
चंडीगढ़, सं.प्र.-160 009
65. विजया बैंक,
मणिमाजरा-6044(अ),
एससीओ-37, पॉकेट सं. 1,
मणिमाजरा,
चंडीगढ़ (सं.प्र.) 160 017

66. विजया बैंक,
भटिंडा-7510(न),
सागर कॉम्प्लेक्स, वाडी अस्पताल के सामने,
मेन गुणियाना रोड, भटिंडा,
पंजाब-151001
67. विजया बैंक,
मंडी गोविन्दगढ़-7541(अ),
बस अड्डा के सामने,
जी.टी. रोड, मंडी गोविन्दगढ़,
फतेहगढ़ साहिब जिला,
पंजाब-147301
68. विजया बैंक,
मोगा-751(न),
बी.जे. सिंह एगो सेल्ज बिल्डिंग,
जी.टी. रोड, मोगा, पंजाब-142001
69. विजया बैंक,
बी.आर.एस. नगर-7512,
लुधियाना-141012
70. विजया बैंक
बटाला-7513(अ),
बी-9, 142/1,
जी.टी. रोड, बटाला,
गुरुदासपुर पंजाब,
पिनकोड-143505
71. विजया बैंक,
मुद्रा पेटिका-9619
सं. 2, नेपचून हाऊस (बेसमेंट),
नवरंगपुरा,
अहमदाबाद-380009
72. विजया बैंक,
बडौली-7334(अ),
जनता सोसाइटी के पास,
स्टेशन रोड, बडौली,
सूरत जिला, गुजरात-394 601
73. विजया बैंक,
एआरएमबी अहमदाबाद-7355(न),
प्रथम तल, कामधेनु कॉम्प्लेक्स,
पंजरापोल, अंबावाडी,
अहमदाबाद-380015
74. विजया बैंक,
गांधीधाम-7338(न)
प्लॉट सं. 3, सेक्टर 1 ए,
गांधीधाम, कच्छ जिला,
गुजरात
75. विजया बैंक,
चांदखेड़ा-7337(अ),
श्यामल कॉम्प्लेक्स,
100 फीट रोड, न्यू जी.सी. रोड, चांदखेड़ा,
अहमदाबाद,
गुजरात-382424
76. विजया बैंक,
सोला क्रॉस रोड-7366,
नवरंग कॉम्प्लेक्स,
सत्तादार सर्कल के पास,
सोला क्रॉस रोड,
अहमदाबाद-380061,
गुजरात राज्य
77. विजया बैंक,
चिंचवाड-5004(न),
मुम्बई-पुणे रोड,
एच.ए. कॉलोनी, पिंप्री,
चिंचवाड, पुणे,
महाराष्ट्र-411018
78. विजया बैंक,
लिक कक्ष, नागपुर-5066 (म),
सं. 93-94, सेंट्रल एवेन्यू रोड,
गांधी बाग,
नागपुर,
महाराष्ट्र-440018
79. विजया बैंक,
कांडिविली, प-5070 (म),
पंचशील हॉइड्स,
90 फीट रोड, महावीर नगर,
कांडिविली, पं. मुम्बई,
महाराष्ट्र-400067
80. विजया बैंक,
दहीसार, पृ. 5069 (म),
साई लीला को.आप. हाउसिंग सोसाइटी लि.
आनंद नगर, दहीसार-पृ. मुम्बई,
महाराष्ट्र-400 058
81. विजया बैंक,
वर्सोवा-5071,
अमय हाऊस,
भू.तल, जे.पी. रोड, वर्सोवा,
मुम्बई-400058
82. विजया बैंक,
डॉ. अंबेडकर रोड,
बांद्रा (प)-5072,
प्लॉट सं. 324, पिन्नकल अपार्टमेंट,
डॉ. अंबेडकर रोड का जंक्शन व
33वां ग्राम, बांद्रा (प),
मुम्बई-400050

83. विजया बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय
शिमोगा-9122,
प्रथम तल,
एपीएमसी गेस्ट हाऊस के सामने,
सागर रोड, शिमोगा-577201,
कर्नाटक

84. विजया बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,
उडुपि-9118,
दूसरा तल, शामिलि इन्,
एन एच 17, अंबालापाडी,
उडुपि-576103,
कर्नाटक।

पंजाब नेशनल बैंक

1. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा : ग्रेजुएट स्कूल ऑफ बिजनेस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन
परिसर,
अल्फा सैक्टर, ग्रेटर नोएडा,
उत्तर प्रदेश

एकीकृत अंचल कार्यालय, कालीकट व कालीकट क्षेत्र

2. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
एकीकृत अंचल कार्यालय,
शताब्दी भवन,
मिनी बाईपास रोड,
पो.आ. गोविन्दपुरम, कालीकट (केरल)
पिन-673016

3. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
के.पी. केशवमेनन रोड,
पोस्ट बैग संख्या 11, कालीकट (केरल)
पिन-673001

4. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शताब्दी भवन, सर्विस ब्लॉक,
मिनी बाईपास रोड,
पो.आ. गोविन्दपुरम, कालीकट (केरल)
पिन-673016

5. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
पोस्ट बैग संख्या 1013
ओएससी कॉम्प्लेक्स, मनोरमा जंक्शन, नडकाप,
कालीकट (केरल),
पिन-673011

6. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
अम्बेडकर बिल्डिंग,
रेलवे स्टेशन लिंक रोड,
कालीकट (केरल),
पिन-673002

7. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
पोस्ट बैग संख्या 132, 5/2521,
इरोत सेंटर, बैंक रोड, कालीकट (केरल),
पिन-673011

8. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
केटीपी टावर्स
साउथ बाजार, कण्णूर (केरल),
पिन-673002

9. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
द्वारा संख्या 8/380-एल,
कुट्टीपुरम रोड, इडापाल (केरल),
पिन-679576

10. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
केपीवी कॉम्प्लेक्स,
जोश थिएटर रोड,
मानन्तावाडी,
जिला वायनाड (केरल),
पिन-670645

11. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
रीमा टावर्स,
मेन रोड, कलपेटा,
जिला वायनाड (केरल),
पिन-673121

एकीकृत अंचल कार्यालय, चेन्नई

वरिष्ठ क्षेत्रीय प्रबन्धक कार्यालय, बेंगलूर

वि. संख्या

12. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
अंचल लेखन सामग्री केन्द्र,
3-4, एच सिद्धा रोड,
बेंगलूर-560002

4212

13. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
380 कामाक्षी कोर्ट,
सदाशिवनगर,
बेंगलूर-560080

1062

14. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
एसएसएलसी बोर्ड के सामने,
6, क्रॉस मल्लेश्वरम,
बेंगलूर-560003

1261

15. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
138, एम.सी. रोड,
मंडया-571401 (कर्नाटक)

2527

16. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
3463/3381, विद्यानगर,
प्रथम क्रॉस बी.एच. रोड,
तुमकूर-572103 (कर्नाटक)

3032

17. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
मार्केट रोड, पोस्ट बाक्स नं.-1177,
एरणाकुलम-682011 (केरल)
18. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
मेनाचेरी बिल्डिंग, बैंक जंक्शन,
नैशनल हाईवे,
अंगमाली, एरणाकुलम-683572
(केरल)
19. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
कोट्टुकुलम रोड, मट्टनचेरी,
कोचिन-682002 (केरल)
20. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
कैरली अपार्टमेंट के सामने,
स्टेच्यू जंक्शन के पास,
त्रिपुनितुरा-682301 (केरल)
21. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
कतरीकड़व, पोस्ट बाक्स नं.-1875,
कतरीकड़व पोस्ट कल्लूर,
एरणाकुलम-682017 (केरल)
22. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक
दरबार हाल रोड,
35/574-5, एरणाकुलम-साउथ-682016 (केरल)
23. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
सुवर्णा पार्क, मेन रोड,
नार्थ परूर-683513 (केरल)
24. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
कुन्नथ बिल्डिंग, पी पी रोड,
पेरम्बावूर-683542 (केरल)

क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, त्रिवेंद्रम (केरल)

जिला अलेप्पी

25. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
मुल्लकल, अलेप्पी,
केरल-688011
26. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
चेंगन्नूर, (अलेप्पी),
केरल-689121
27. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
अमृता कम्प्लैक्स,
चेरतला (अलेप्पी),
केरल-688524
28. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
एन.एस.एस. यूनिशन बिल्डिंग,
हरिपाड़ (अलेप्पी)
केरल-690514

29. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
पेरुमल जंक्शन,
मानार (अलेप्पी),
केरल-689622
30. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
मावेलीकरा (अलेप्पी),
केरल-690101
जिला इडक्की
31. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
मारियल टॉवर्स, मेन रोड,
तोडुपुषा (इडक्की)
केरल-685584

जिला कोल्लम

32. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
आश्रमम्, कोल्लम,
केरल-691001.
33. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
चामकडा, कोल्लम,
केरल-691001.
34. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
व्यू. एस. रोड, कोल्लम,
केरल-691001.
35. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
तेजस् बिल्डिंग,
कोट्टारकरा (कोल्लम),
केरल-691531.

जिला कोट्टयम

36. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
एम.सी. रोड,
चंगनाशेरी (कोट्टयम)
केरल-686101.
37. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक
लोगोस सेंटर, कोट्टयम्,
केरल-861001.
38. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
टी.बी. रोड, कोट्टयम,
केरल-686575
39. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
पाला (कोट्टयम),
केरल-686575

जिला पत्तनमतिट्टा

40. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
तिरुमल देवस्वम बिल्डिंग,
कोयंचेरी (पत्तनमतिट्टा),
केरल-689641

41. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
एम.सी. रोड,
रामनचिरा,
तिरुवल्ला,
केरल-689101
42. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
रैलिश टॉवर्स,
एम.सी. रोड,
एन.आर. आई, तिरुवल्ला,
केरल-689101

जिला त्रिचूर

43. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
हसन सन्स कम्पलैक्स,
चावकाड़ (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680506
44. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
मेन रोड,
देसमंगलम (त्रिचूर),
केरल-679532
45. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
पश्चिमी नडा
गुरुवायूर (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680101
46. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
पी. ओ. मट्टम,
कण्डनाशेरी (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680602
47. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
करुपड़न्ना (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680670
48. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
पी. ओ. कुषुकुल्ली,
मूरकनिकरा (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680752
49. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
पावरट्टी (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680507
50. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
साउथ हिल आर्केड,
पल्लयन्नूर (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680587

51. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
बाजार रोड,
पुदुकाड़ (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680301
52. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
इकारत बिल्डिंग,
तालिकुलम (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680569
53. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
कुरुप्पम रोड, त्रिचूर,
केरल-680001

54. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
चैतन्य बिल्डिंग
वलापाड़ (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680567
55. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
वणियमपारा (त्रिचूर),
केरल-680652

जिला त्रिवेन्द्रम

56. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
मेडिकल कॉलेज, त्रिवेन्द्रम,
केरल-695011
57. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
पालकुलंगरा,
त्रिवेन्द्रम,
केरल-695008
58. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय
सी.पी.जी.पी. टॉवर्स,
जनरल हॉस्पिटल रोड,
स्टैच्यू जंक्शन,
त्रिवेन्द्रम,
केरल-695001
59. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
रेलवे स्टेशन रोड,
त्रिवेन्द्रम (केरल),
पिन-695001
60. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक
स्टैच्यू जंक्शन,
त्रिवेन्द्रम,
केरल-695001।

MINISTRY OF FINANCE**(Department of Economic Affairs)****(BANKING DIVISION)**

New Delhi, the 22nd September, 2005

S.O. 3551.—In Pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use of official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government, hereby, notifies the listed offices/branches of the following banks/Financial Institution in the attached annexure, more than 80 % of the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

S. No.	Name of the Banks	Number of Offices/ Branches
1.	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	02
2.	State Bank of India	473
3.	Vijaya Bank	84
4.	Punjab National Bank	60
Total		619

[F. No. 11016/9/2005-Hindi]

RAMESH BABU ANIYERY, Jt. Director (OL)

**STATE BANK OF BIKANER AND JAIPUR
HEAD OFFICE
JAIPUR**

1. PAOTA (JAIPUR)**Address :**

Near Bus Stand
PAOTA-303106
Distt. JAIPUR
(Rajasthan)

2. NEW ATISH MARKET, JAIPUR**Address :**

S-2
New Atish Market,
Gopalpura Bye Pass Road,
Mansarovar,
JAIPUR-302019
(Rajasthan)

STATE BANK OF INDIA

1. State Bank of India,
Karjee Branch
AT & Post-Karjee,
Tal. Khed,
Dist. Ratnagiri,
Pin-415727

2. State Bank of India,
Dabhil Naka Branch
Post Lavel, Tal. Khed,
Dist. Ratnagiri,
Pin-415708
3. State Bank of India,
Phungus Branch
AT & Post-Phungus,
Tal. Sangmeshwar,
Dist. Ratnagiri,
Pin-415611
4. State Bank of India,
Tirlot Branch
AT & Post-Tirlot,
Tal. Devgad,
Dist. Sindhudurg,
Pin-416804
5. State Bank of India,
Kelus Branch
AT & Post-Kelus,
Tal. Kudal,
Dist. Sindhudurg,
Pin-416520
6. State Bank of India,
Priol-Mangueshi Branch
Tal. Ponda, Dist. North Goa,
Pin-403404
7. State Bank of India,
Guleli Branch
AT & Post-Guleli,
Tal. Sattari,
North Goa, Pin-403504
8. State Bank of India,
Staff Training Centre,
25-A, "Patto Plaza,"
Near Kadamba Bus Terminus,
Panaji-Goa,
Pin-403001
9. State Bank of India,
Staff Training Centre,
78, Koregaon Park,
North Main Road,
Pune-411001
10. State Bank of India,
Staff Training Centre,
N-7, (South) Cidco,
Jalgoan Road,
Aurangabad
11. State Bank of India,
Rehabilitation and
Recovery Branch,
2nd Floor, 'The Arcade'
World Trade Centre
Cuffe Parade, Colaba
Pin-400005

12. State Bank of India,
Security Services Branch,
2nd Floor,
Mumbai Main Branch Premises,
Mumbai Samachar Marg,
Pin-400023
13. State Bank of India,
Zonal Office, Mumbai-1
88 C, D G P House,
Old Prabhadevi Road,
Mumbai-400025
14. State Bank of India,
Zonal Office, Mumbai-II
88 C, D G P House,
Old Prabhadevi Road,
Mumbai-400025
15. State Bank of India,
Byculla Branch,
P.B. No. 22,
340, J. J. Marg, Byculla,
Mumbai-400008
16. State Bank of India,
Churchgate Branch,
"The International",
Maharshi Karve Road,
P.B. No. 11179,
Churchgate, Mumbai-400020
17. State Bank of India,
Cuffe Parade Branch,
6, "World" Trade Centre,
Cuffe Parade Colaba,
Mumbai-400005.
18. State Bank of India,
Dadar Branch,
Swami Dynanjivandas Path,
Near Dadar Post Office,
Dadar, Mumbai-400014
19. State Bank of India,
Juhu Tara Branch,
"Shree Lalita"
Near flying club,
Juhu Tara Road,
Juhu, Mumbai-400049
20. State Bank of India,
Juhu Vile Parle Scheme Branch,
Plot No. 90, Yogi Smruti,
10th Road, Juhu Vile Parle,
Dev Scheme, Mumbai-400057
21. State Bank of India,
Linking Road Branch,
Bandra, Mumbai-400052
22. State Bank of India,
Madame Cama Road Branch,
P. Box No. 11588,
Madame Cama Road,
Mumbai-400021
23. State Bank of India,
Mahim Branch,
Vijan apartments,
Lady Jamshedji Road,
Mumbai-400016
24. State Bank of India,
Mandvi Branch,
P.B. No. 3217
75 Abdul Rehman Road,
Mumbai-400003
25. State Bank of India,
MICR Cheque Processing Centre,
Madhuli, 1st Floor,
H-2, Shivsagar Estate,
Dr. Annie Besant Road,
Worli, Mumbai-400018
26. State Bank of India,
Napean Sea Road Branch,
Laxmi Vilas, 87, Napean Sea Road,
P. Box, No. 6151,
Mumbai-400008
27. State Bank of India,
Pedder Road Branch,
Mumbai-400026
28. State Bank of India,
Santacruz (West) Branch,
Mumbai-400054
29. State Bank of India,
Service Branch,
7, Killick House,
Charanjit Rai Marg,
Mumbai-400001
30. State Bank of India,
Spl. Personal Banking Branch,
Mumbai Samachar Marg,
Post Box No. 1965,
Mumbai-400023
31. State Bank of India,
Turner Road, (Bandra) Branch,
3/35, Meherdad Turner Road,
Bandra (West),
Mumbai-400050
32. State Bank of India,
Vakola Branch,
Santacruz (East) Branch,
Mumbai-400055

33. State Bank of India,
Vile Parle (East) Branch,
P. B. No. 0877,
Mumbai-400 057
34. State Bank of India,
Worli (North) Branch,
Nirjon House,
Dr. Annie Besant Road,
Worli, Mumbai-400 025
35. State Bank of India,
Antop Hill Branch,
Quarter No. 1329 & 1330,
Central Govt. Colony,
Kane Nagar, Antop Hill,
Mumbai-400 037
36. State Bank of India,
August Kranti Maidan Branch,
Jamshed Hall, Forjett Street,
Gowalia Tank Road,
Mumbai-400 038
37. State Bank of India,
Bhulabai Desai Road Branch,
Bhulabai Desai Road,
Mumbai-400 026
38. State Bank of India,
D. N. Road Branch,
7, Killick House,
Charanjit Rai Marg,
Mumbai-400 001
39. State Bank of India,
Dharavi Branch,
Diamond Apartment,
Jasmin Mill Road,
Mahim-(East), Mumbai-400 017
40. State Bank of India,
Fort Market Branch,
Bhagwan Bhawan,
71-73, Mint Road,
Mumbai-400 001
41. State Bank of India,
Gateway of India Branch,
Ram Nimi, 8, Mandlik Road,
Colaba, Mumbai-400 039
42. State Bank of India,
Girgaon Branch,
P. B. No. 3611,
Mumbai-400 004
43. State Bank of India,
Hughes Road Branch,
Aderbad 34, Hughes Road,
Mumbai-400 007
44. State Bank of India,
Jacob Circle Branch,
Simplex Mills Compound,
Keshwrao Khade Road,
P. B. No. 6258,
Mumbai-400 011
45. State Bank of India,
Kalachowki Branch,
Abhyuday Edu. Society High School,
Abhyuday Nagar, Mumbai-400 037
46. State Bank of India,
Kemps Corner Branch,
Anmol Ratna Premises Co-op. Hsg. Soc. Ltd.,
Oomar Park 95, Bomanji Petit Lane,
Mumbai-400 026
47. State Bank of India,
Lalbaug Branch,
75, Dr. Ambedkar Road,
Kalachowki, P. B. No. 7818,
Mumbai-400 033
48. State Bank of India,
Lower Parel Branch,
Madhusudan Mills Compound
Pandurang Buddhav Marg,
Mumbai-400 013
49. State Bank of India,
Dr. M. L. Dahanukar Branch,
Indira Apartments
Dr. M. L. Dahanukar Marg,
Mumbai-400 026
50. State Bank of India,
Masjid Bunder Branch,
Rajgor Chambers,
Masjid Low Level Road,
P. B. No. 5211,
Mumbai-400 009
51. State Bank of India,
Matunga Branch,
Gujrat Kelwani Mandal,
76-A, "Rafi Ahmed Kidwai Road,"
Matunga, Mumbai-400 019
52. State Bank of India,
Mazgaon Branch,
B.P.T. Workshop, Old C.A.M. Office,
Ground Floor, Opp. Nirman Bhavan,
Narlu Vithoba Nakhava Marg,
Mazgaon, Mumbai-400 010
53. State Bank of India,
Bombay Central Station Branch,
P. B. No. 4515,
Mumbai-400 095

54. State Bank of India,
Naigaon (Dadar) Branch,
S. S. Wagh Marg,
Mumbai-400 014
55. State Bank of India,
Nariman Point Branch,
Dalamal House,
Jamunlal Bajaj Marg,
Nariman Point,
Mumbai-400 021.
56. State Bank of India,
Parel T. T. Branch,
Mitradham Co-op- Hsg. Society,
J. B. Marg, Mumbai-400 012
57. State Bank of India,
Sewari Branch,
Tokersi Jivraj Road,
Mumbai-400 015
58. State Bank of India,
Shivaji Park Branch,
West Dadar Co-op. Housing Society Bldg.,
Ranade Road, Dadar,
Mumbai-400 028
59. State Bank of India,
Shiva Sagar Estate Worli (South) Br.
Post. Bag No. 16555, Dr. Annie Besant Road,
Worli, Mumbai-400 018
60. State Bank of India,
Veer Savarkar Marg Br.
Rhgved Co-op. Socy. Bldg.,
Cadell Road, Mumbai
61. State Bank of India,
Wadala Branch, Podar House,
R.A. Kidwai Road, Mumbai-400 031
62. State Bank of India,
Walkeshwar Branch, 244 Vidhani Cottage,
Walkeshwar Rd., Mumbai-400 006
63. State Bank of India,
Woodehouse Road Branch, Lalit Building,
P.B. No. 10021, Colaba, Mumbai
64. State Bank of India,
Worli Sea Face Branch, Sagar Tarang Co-op
Hsg. Society, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan Road,
Mumbai-400 030
65. State Bank of India,
Personal Banking Branch,
Charievilla 'A' Road,
Churchgate (W) Mumbai-400 020
66. State Bank of India,
Chembur Branch, M.D.S. Road,
Mumbai-400 071
67. State Bank of India,
Andheri (East) Branch, Vrindavan,
Sir M. V. Road, Mumbai-400 069
68. State Bank of India,
Andheri (West) Branch,
Rahul Apartments,
Swami Vivekanand Road,
Andheri (West), Mumbai-400 058
69. State Bank of India,
Borivili (East) Branch, "Manodaya"
Dattapada Pathak Marg,
Mumbai-400 066
70. State Bank of India,
Borivli (West) Branch, Onusadan,
Ghodbandar Road, Mumbai-400 092
71. State Bank of India,
Goregaon (West) Branch,
9, Jawahar Nagar, Swami Vivekanand Rd.,
Goregaon (West), Mumbai-400 062
72. State Bank of India,
I A C C Branch,
Mumbai Air Port, Near Sahar Village,
Mumbai-400 057
73. State Bank of India,
Kandivili (West) Branch,
Shantilal Modi Road,
Mumbai-400 067
74. State Bank of India,
Malad (West) Branch,
S. V. Road, Near Chincholi Fatak,
Malad (West), Mumbai-400 064
75. State Bank of India,
Kurla (West) Branch,
171, Lalbahadur Shastri Road,
Kurla, Mumbai-400 070
76. State Bank of India,
Marol Branch,
Chandra Apartments, Marol Maroshi Road,
Mumbai-400 059
77. State Bank of India,
Versova Branch,
Andheri Versova Main Road,
Mumbai-400 058
78. State Bank of India,
Ghatkopar (East) Branch,
Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Mumbai, Maharashtra-400 077
79. State Bank of India,
Kalyan Branch,
Dist. Thane,
Thane-421 301

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>80. State Bank of India,
Naupada Thane Branch,
425, Gokhale Road,
Dist. Thane,
Thane-400 602</p> <p>81. State Bank of India,
Thane Branch, Thane-400 601</p> <p>82. State Bank of India,
Aghai Branch,
At. Aghai Taluka Shahapur,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra</p> <p>83. State Bank of India,
Ambarnath Branch,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra</p> <p>84. State Bank of India,
Badlapur Ind. Estate Branch,
Shed No. W-68, MIDC Area,
Post Kulgaon, Tal. Ulhasnagar,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra-421 503</p> <p>85. State Bank of India,
BARC Branch,
Central Admn. Bldg., Trombay,
Mumbai 400 085</p> <p>86. State Bank of India,
BEST Depot (Kurla) Branch,
L.B.S. Marg, Mumbai-400 070</p> <p>87. State Bank of India,
Bhandup Branch,
Mumbai-400 078</p> <p>88. State Bank of India,
Bhiwandi Branch,
Thane, Maharashtra</p> <p>89. State Bank of India,
Deonar Branch,
Deonar Bus Depot, Bombay-400 088</p> <p>90. State Bank of India,
Dombivli (East) Branch,
Bhramchaitanya, Tilak Road,
Dombivli (East), Dist. Thane</p> <p>91. State Bank of India,
Focal Point Branch,
Anuradha Ind. Comp.
Kurla-Andheri Road, Mumbai-400 072</p> <p>92. State Bank of India,
Gorhe Branch,
P.O. Gorhe Via Port Manora,
Tal. Wada, Dist. Thane, Maharashtra</p> <p>93. State Bank of India,
IIT Powai Branch,
Mumbai-400 076</p> | <p>94. State Bank of India,
Jawhar Branch,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra</p> <p>95. State Bank of India,
J.K. Gram Branch,
"Jai Tower" Opp. Cadbury's,
463, Pokhran Road, Thane-400 601</p> <p>96. State Bank of India,
Kanjur Marg Branch,
Akash Deep, Kanjur Village Road,
Mumbai-400 078</p> <p>97. State Bank of India,
Mahul Road (Chembur) Branch,
Mumbai-400 074</p> <p>98. State Bank of India,
Mulund (W) Branch,
Laxmi Mahadeo Niwas,
Sevaram Dadlani Marg,
Mulund (West), Mumbai-400 080</p> <p>99. State Bank of India,
Mulund (East) Branch,
Mumbai, Maharashtra</p> <p>100. State Bank of India,
Thane Creek Branch,
Thane-Badlapur Road,
P. Ghansoli, Thane, Mumbai-401 701</p> <p>101. State Bank of India,
Safed Pul Branch,
Anuradha Indl. Comp.,
Mathurdas Visanji Road,
(Kurla-Andheri Road)
Mumbai-400 078</p> <p>102. State Bank of India,
Sakinaka Branch,
Vihar Lake Road, Mumbai-400 078</p> <p>103. State Bank of India,
Sahapur Branch, Dist. Thane, Maharashtra</p> <p>104. State Bank of India,
Spl. Small Industry Business Ghatkopar (W)
Branch, Ashok Silk Mills Compound,
1st Floor, Bahadur Shastri Marg,
Ghatkopar (W) Mumbai-400 086</p> <p>105. State Bank of India,
Swastik Park (Chembur) Branch,
Sion Trombay Road, Post Bag No. 17236
Mumbai-400 071</p> <p>106. State Bank of India,
Thane (East) Branch,
Naad Brahama, Adarsha Niwas,
Thane (East) Pin 400 603</p> |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 107. State Bank of India,
Ulhas Nagar Branch,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra | 120. State Bank of India,
Dahisar (East) Branch,
Dev Ashish Shopping & Service Indus. Estate,
Sir Bharucha Road, Mumbai-400 068 |
| 108. State Bank of India,
Vihar Lake Branch,
Nitie Campus, Mumbai-400 067 | 121. State Bank of India,
Malad (East) Branch,
Filka Bhavan, Poddar Marg,
P.B. No. 17604, Mumbai-400 064 |
| 109. State Bank of India,
Vikhroli (East) Branch,
Bldg. No. 2, Kannamwar Nagar,
Vikhroli (East) | 122. State Bank of India,
Mira Industrial Estate Branch,
Plot No. 53, Hissa No. 4,
Mira Road Post Office,
Mira, Dist. Thane |
| 110. State Bank of India,
Vikhroli (West) Branch,
Station Road,
Mumbai-400 079 | 123. State Bank of India,
Navghar Bassein Road Branch,
Dist. Thane,
Maharashtra |
| 111. State Bank of India,
Wada Branch, P. O. Wada,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra | 124. State Bank of India,
Pali Market Bandra (West) Branch,
Dr. Ambedkar Road, Mumbai-400 050 |
| 112. State Bank of India,
Personal Banking Branch, Sion (W)
Mumbai-400 022 | 125. State Bank of India,
Alibag Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 201 |
| 113. State Bank of India,
Personal Banking Branch,
101 Delta, Hiranandani Gardens,
Powai, Mumbai-400 076 | 126. State Bank of India,
Ambet Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 101 |
| 114. State Bank of India,
Thane Collectorate Campus Branch,
Netaji Subhash Bose Road,
Thane-400 601 | 127. State Bank of India,
BAPMC Branch,
Navi Mumbai-400 704 |
| 115. State Bank of India,
Bassein Branch, P. B. No. 1,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra | 128. State Bank of India,
J.N.P.T. Branch,
Tal. Uran, Dist. Raigad,
Maharashtra |
| 116. State Bank of India,
Bassein Taluka Industrial Estate Branch,
Achola Village, Taluka Bassein,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra | 129. State Bank of India,
Kamothe Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-410 206 |
| 117. State Bank of India,
Bhayander Branch,
Station Road, Taluka Bassein
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra-401 101 | 130. State Bank of India,
Khopoli Branch, Tal. Karjat
Dist. Raigad 410 203,
Maharashtra |
| 118. State Bank of India,
Carter Road Branch,
Golden Rock Annex,
Master Vinayak Cross Road,
(Perry Cross Road) Bandra (West),
Mumbai-400 050 | 131. State Bank of India,
Konkan Bhavan Branch,
Navi Mumbai, Cidco Bhavan,
Maharashtra-400 614 |
| 119. State Bank of India,
Dahanu Road Branch,
Post House Dahanu Road,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra,
Mumbai-400 602 | 132. State Bank of India,
Mahad Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 301 |
| | 133. State Bank of India,
Mangaon Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 104 |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 134. State Bank of India,
Murud Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 401 | 150. State Bank of India,
Upper Tudil Branch,
Tal. Mahad,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra |
| 135. State Bank of India,
Nagothane Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 106 | 151. State Bank of India,
Uran Branch,
Tal. Uran, Dist. Raigad,
Maharashtra |
| 136. State Bank of India,
Nandgaon Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra | 152. State Bank of India,
Wakan SAB Branch,
Tal. Poladpur,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra |
| 137. State Bank of India,
Nhava Sheva Branch,
Port Users Bld., JNPT,
Navi Mumbai | 153. State Bank of India,
Vashi Turbhe Branch,
P.O.K.U. Bazar, Navi Mumbai
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-400 705 |
| 138. State Bank of India,
Panvel Branch,
278, Safiya Terrace, M. G. Road,
Panvel, Dist. Raigad,
Maharashtra-410 206 | 154. State Bank of India,
Zirad Branch, Tal. Alibag,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 201 |
| 139. State Bank of India,
Pedali SAB Branch,
Tal. Sudhagad, Dist. Raigad,
Maharashtra-410 205 | 155. State Bank of India,
Evershine Nagar Branch,
Malad (West), Mumbai-400 064 |
| 140. State Bank of India,
Pen Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 107 | 156. State Bank of India,
Bandra (East) Branch,
Jeles Edu. Society Bldg.,
Govt. Colony, Mumbai-400 051 |
| 141. State Bank of India,
Poynd Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 108 | 157. State Bank of India,
Goregaon (East) Branch,
ASPM Bldg., 12 Jayprakash Nagar,
Jaiprakash Road, Mumbai-400 063 |
| 142. State Bank of India,
Rasayani Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-410 207 | 158. State Bank of India,
Jogeshwari (East) Branch,
Caves Road, Dastur Bhavan,
Mumbai-400 060 |
| 143. State Bank of India,
Roha Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 109 | 159. State Bank of India,
Jogeshwari (West) Branch,
Opp. Ram Shyam Cinema,
Swami Vivekanand Road,
Mumbai-400 060 |
| 144. State Bank of India,
Salav Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 210 | 160. State Bank of India,
Khar (West) Branch,
Plot No. 81, S.V. Road,
Mumbai-400052 |
| 145. State Bank of India,
Sawad V.B. Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 301 | 161. State Bank of India,
Mount Mery Branch,
Monalisa John Baptist Road,
Near Mount Merry Stop,
Bandra-400050 |
| 146. State Bank of India,
Shrivardhan Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 110 | 162. State Bank of India,
Palghar Branch,
Mahim Marg,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra |
| 147. State Bank of India,
Sudagad Pali (P) Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 205 | |
| 148. State Bank of India,
Thal Bazar Branch,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 207 | |
| 149. State Bank of India,
Thal Vaishet Branch, Tal Alibag,
Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra-402 207 | |

- | | |
|--|--|
| 163. State Bank of India,
Shankar Galli Branch,
Opp. Parsi Hall, Kandivli (West),
Mumbai-400067 | 174. State Bank of India,
Ichalkaranji Branch,
Dist. Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416115 |
| 164. State Bank of India,
Talasari Branch,
Post & Taluka Talasari,
Dist. Thane, Maharashtra | 175. State Bank of India,
Dasara Chowk, Kolhapur,
Laxmipuri, Kolhapur,
Maharashtra, Pin. No. 416002 |
| 165. State Bank of India,
Tarapur Industrial Estate Branch,
Plot No. H-1, Via Boisar,
Dist Thane-401501 | 176. State Bank of India,
Miraj Branch,
Shaniwar Peth, Miraj,
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin. No. 416416 |
| 166. State Bank of India,
Virar Branch, Dist. Thane,
Maharashtra | 177. State Bank of India,
Sangli Branch,
Ganpati Peth, Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 416416 |
| 167. State Bank of India,
Vile Parle (W) Branch,
Irla Marg,
Khadi Village Indl. Estate,
Commission Premises,
Mumbai-400053 | 178. State Bank of India,
Gadhinglaj Branch,
Nehru Chowk,
Dist. Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin. No. 416502 |
| 168. State Bank of India,
Virwani Indl. Estate Branch,
Kohineer Industrial Estate,
Dindoshi Village, Goregaon (E),
Mumbai-400063 | 179. State Bank of India,
Tasgaon Branch,
Guruwar Peth,
Tasgaon, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 416312 |
| 169. State Bank of India,
Vazira Branch,
Prasanna Nagar,
Lokmanya Tilak Road,
Vazira, Borivli (West),
Mumbai-400092 | 180. State Bank of India,
Islampur (Walva) Branch,
Post Bag No. 1,
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin. No. 415409 |
| 170. State Bank of India,
PB Vile Parle (East) Branch,
Shrikunj V.P.M. Road,
Juhu Scheme, Vile Parle (East),
Mumbai-400056 | 181. State Bank of India,
Bhudargad (Gargoti) Branch,
Post Box No. 1,
Dist. Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416201 |
| 171. State Bank of India,
Personal Banking Branch,
Lokhandwala Complex,
Raheja Classic, Link Road Oshivara,
Andheri (West),
Mumbai-400058 | 182. State Bank of India,
Shirol Branch, Taluka Shirol,
Dist. Kolhapur,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 416103 |
| 172. State Bank of India,
Hatkalangda Branch,
Post Bag No. 1,
Dist. Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416109 | 183. State Bank of India,
Market Yard Kolhapur Branch,
Shree Shahu Market Yard,
Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416005 |
| 173. State Bank of India,
Vita (Khanapur) Branch,
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 415311 | 184. State Bank of India,
Parvati Industrial Area Branch,
Ichalkaranji, Taluka Shirol,
Dist. Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416121 |

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>185. State Bank of India,
MIDC (Kupwad) Sangli Branch,
Krishna Valley Complex,
MIDC Kupwad, Sangli,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416436</p> <p>186. State Bank of India,
Arag Branch,
Taluka Miraj, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin. No. 416401</p> <p>187. State Bank of India,
Bhavaninagar Branch,
Taluka Walva, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin. No. 415302</p> <p>188. State Bank of India,
Bhilwadi Branch,
At/Post Bhilwadi,
Taluka Palus,
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin 416303</p> <p>189. State Bank of India,
Palus Branch,
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416310</p> <p>190. State Bank of India,
Wanless Hospital Miraj Branch,
Wanless Hospital Compound,
Taluka Miraj, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 416410</p> <p>191. State Bank of India,
Kasegaon Branch,
Taluka Walva, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 415404</p> <p>192. State Bank of India,
Abdul Lat Branch,
Taluka Shirol, Dist. Kolhapur,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416130</p> <p>193. State Bank of India,
Nannaj Branch,
Taluka Kavathemahakal,
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 413307</p> <p>194. State Bank of India,
Nagthane Branch,
Post Box No. 1, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 416313</p> <p>195. State Bank of India,
Rajaram Timber Market Branch,
Kalamb Road, Kolhapur,
Maharashtra, Pin No. 416012</p> | <p>196. State Bank of India,
Baba Jaragnagar Branch,
"Anandi Smriti", Pachgaon,
Near Pachgaon Octroi Naka,
Layout No. 4, Kolhapur,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416007</p> <p>197. State Bank of India,
Jath Branch,
Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416404</p> <p>198. State Bank of India,
Shiroli MIDC Branch,
C.P.C. Building,
Shiroli MIDC Area,
Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416122</p> <p>199. State Bank of India,
Kolhapur Treasury Branch,
Aashish Chambers,
393 B, E Ward,
Shahupuri, Kolhapur,
Maharashtra,
Pin. 416001</p> <p>200. State Bank of India,
Bhuye Branch,
Taluka Karvir,
Dist. Kolhapur,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416002</p> <p>201. Nevari Branch,
Taluka Vita (Khanpur),
Dist. Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin. No. 415311</p> <p>202. State Bank of India,
MIDC Gokul Shirgaon,
At/Post Gokul Shirgaon,
Taluka Karvir, Dist. Kolhapur,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416216</p> <p>203. State Bank of India,
Market Yard Sangli Branch,
Plot No. 365,
Vasant market Yard Sangli,
Taluka Miraj, Dist. Sangli,
Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416416</p> <p>204. State Bank of India,
Shivajinagar Sangli Branch,
445A, Deokar Building,
Sangli, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416416</p> |
|---|---|

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>205. State Bank of India,
Pimpalgaon S.A. Branch,
At/Post Pimpalgaon,
Taluka Bhudargad (Gargoti),
Dist. Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin No. 416209</p> <p>206. State Bank of India,
P.B.B. Rajarampuri Branch,
2021/3 E Ward,
Vardhman Terraces,
Kolhapur, Maharashtra,
Pin. No. 416008</p> <p>207. State Bank of India,
Abhona Branch,
Abhona, Tal. Kalwan,
Dist. Nasik, Pin No. 423 502</p> <p>208. State Bank of India,
Aswali Branch,
Aswali, Tal. Igatpuri,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-422402</p> <p>209. State Bank of India,
Chandwad (Chandor) Branch,
Pir Chowk, Chandwad,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-423105</p> <p>210. State Bank of India,
Cidco Colony (Vilholi) Branch,
Lekhanagar,
dist. Nasik, Pin-422009</p> <p>211. State Bank of India,
Deolali Branch,
Anand Marg, Deolali,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-422401</p> <p>212. State Bank of India,
Dhodambe Branch,
Peth Galli,
At Post Dhodambe,
Tal. Chandwad, Dist. Nasik</p> <p>213. State Bank of India,
Dindori Branch,
Kalwan Road,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-422202</p> <p>214. State Bank of India,
Dugaon Branch,
Tal. Chandwad,
Dist. Nasik,
Pin-423104</p> <p>215. State Bank of India,
Gangapur Road Branch,
Moti Villa, S.T. Colony,
Gangapur Road,
Dist. Nasik,
Pin-422005</p> | <p>216. State Bank of India,
Igatpuri Branch,
Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Igatpuri, Dist. Nasik,
Pin-422403</p> <p>217. State Bank of India,
Kalwan Branch,
Ganesh Nagar,
At & Post Kalwan,
Tal. Kalwan, Dist. Nasik</p> <p>218. State Bank of India,
Lasalgaon Branch,
Station Road, Lasalgaon,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-422306</p> <p>219. State Bank of India,
Malegaon Branch,
Camp Road, Malegaon,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-423203</p> <p>220. State Bank of India,
Manmad Branch,
Abdul Hamid Road,
Manmad, Dist. Nasik,
Pin-423104</p> <p>221. State Bank of India,
Nandgaon Branch,
Tahsil Nandgaon,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-423106</p> <p>222. State Bank of India,
Nasik Road Branch,
Rajhans Building,
Shastri Road,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-422101</p> <p>223. State Bank of India,
Niphad Branch,
Niphad, Dist. Nasik,
Pin-422303</p> <p>224. State Bank of India,
Ojhar Branch,
HAL Complex, Ojhar,
Tal. Niphad, Dist. Nasik,
Pin-422207</p> <p>225. State Bank of India,
Panchavati (Nasik) Branch,
Laxmi-Vijay Building,
Peth Naka,
Dist. Nasik, Pin-422003</p> <p>226. State Bank of India,
Peint (Peth) Branch,
Uttam Complex,
Balsad Road,
At & Post Peth,
Dist. Nasik</p> |
|--|--|

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>227. State Bank of India,
Pimpalgaon (Baswant) Branch,
Tal. Niphad, Dist. Nasik.
Pin-422 209</p> <p>228. State Bank of India,
Pimpalnare S.A. Branch,
Tahsil Dindori, Dist. Nasik.
Maharashtra</p> <p>229. State Bank of India,
Satana (Baglan) Branch,
Satana (Baglan), Dist. Nasik.
Pin-423 301</p> <p>230. State Bank of India,
Shivare S.A. Branch,
At & Post Shivare,
Tal. Chandwad, Dist. Nasik.
Pin-422 215</p> <p>231. State Bank of India,
Sinnar Branch,
Opp. S.T. Stand,
Sinnar, Dist. Nasik.
Pin-422 103</p> <p>232. State Bank of India,
Nasik Treasury Branch,
Collector Office Compound,
Nasik.
Pin-422 002</p> <p>233. State Bank of India,
Trimbakeshwar Branch,
Main Road, Trimbakeshwar,
Dist. Nasik, Maharashtra.</p> <p>234. State Bank of India,
Vadivarhe S.A. Branch,
Vadivarhe, Tahsil Igatpuri,
Dist. Nasik, Maharashtra.</p> <p>235. State Bank of India,
Yeola Branch,
Yeola, Dist. Nasik.
Pin-423 401</p> <p>236. State Bank of India,
Zodge Branch,
At & Post Zodge,
Tal. Malegaon,
Dist. Nasik, Maharashtra</p> <p>237. State Bank of India,
BE G Khadki (Pune) Branch,
P.B. No. 13, BEG Khadki,
Pune-411 003</p> <p>238. State Bank of India,
Bhor Branch,
Mangalvar Peth,
Dist. Pune
Pin No.-412 206</p> | <p>239. State Bank of India,
Chakan Branch,
Taluka Khed,
Dist. Pune
Pin No.-410 501</p> <p>240. State Bank of India,
Chandkhed S.A. Branch,
Maval Taluka,
Dist. Pune.
Pin No-410 506</p> <p>241. State Bank of India,
Chinchwad Branch,
Bombay-Pune Highway,
Dist. Pune,
Maharashtra,
Pin No-411 019</p> <p>242. State Bank of India,
Dattawadi (Pune) Branch,
Surya Plaza, 214 Navi Peth,
Lal Bahadur Shastri Road, Pune,
Maharashtra-441-030</p> <p>243. State Bank of India,
Katraj Branch,
Near Bharati Vidyapeeth,
Pune-Satara Road, Katraj,
Pune-411 046</p> <p>244. State Bank of India,
Khadki Branch,
3, Arjun Marg,
Pune-411 003</p> <p>245. State Bank of India,
Kurkumbh Branch,
MIDC, Kurkumbh,
Daund, Dist. Pune,
Maharashtra-413 105</p> <p>246. State Bank of India,
Lonavla Branch,
Dist. Pune,
Maharashtra-410 401</p> <p>247. State Bank of India,
MIDC Baramati Branch,
Bhigwan Road, Baramati,
Maharashtra-413 102</p> <p>248. State Bank of India,
Hadapsar Branch,
Kanchangunga Apartments
Pune-Solapur Road,
Pune-411 028</p> <p>249. State Bank of India,
Hingne (Khurd) Branch,
Rushiketu Singhgad Road,
Hingne Khurd,
Pune-411 051</p> |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 250. State Bank of India,
I A T Girinagar Branch,
Pune-411 025 | 263. State Bank of India,
Shirur (Ghodnadi) Branch,
P. O. Ghodnadi,
Pin No-412 210 |
| 251. State Bank of India,
I.N.S. Shivaji (Lonavla) Branch,
Dist. Pune, Maharashtra
Pin No-410 402 | 264. State Bank of India,
Bund Garden Branch,
Doongursee Park,
22 Bund Road,
Pune-411 001 |
| 252. State Bank of India,
Dhankawadi (Pune) Branch,
Balajinagar Corner, Ellora Palace,
Pune-Satara Road,
Pune-411 043 | 265. State Bank of India,
Market Yard (Pune) Branch,
Gultekadi, Pune-411 037 |
| 253. State Bank of India,
Golibar Maidan Branch,
Shankar Sheth Road,
Pune-411 001 | 266. State Bank of India,
Pulgate Branch,
Pancharatna Apartments,
Pune 411 013 |
| 254. State Bank of India,
HDFC Complex Chinchwad Branch,
Pune Maharashtra,
Pin No-411 019. | 267. State Bank of India,
Treasury Branch, Pune,
P. B. No. 78,
Collector Office Compound,
Dr. Ambedkar Road,
Pune-411 001 |
| 255. State Bank of India,
N C L Campus (Pune) Branch,
Pashan Road,
Pune-411 008 | 268. State Bank of India,
Purandar (Saswad) Branch,
Saswad PO, Maharashtra.
Pin No-412 301 |
| 256. State Bank of India,
N D A Khadakvasla Branch,
Pune-411 023 | 269. State Bank of India,
S I B Branch, (Pune),
Tara Chambers
Mumbai Pune Road,
Pune, Maharashtra-411 003 |
| 257. State Bank of India,
Paud Road (Pune) Branch,
Opp. Anandanagar,
Pune-411 038 | 270. State Bank of India,
Deccan Gymkhana Branch,
Pune, Maharashtra-411 003 |
| 258. State Bank of India,
PBB Branch,
Senapati Bapat Road (Pune),
Pune-411 016 | 271. State Bank of India,,
Aundh Branch,
Plot No. 6, Sanewadi,
Pune, Maharashtra-411 007 |
| 259. State Bank of India,
Pimpri Branch,
Post Box No. 1,
Kasarwadi Post,
Pune-411 034 | 272. State Bank of India,
Agri. Dev. Branch (Indapur),
Distt. Pune
Maharashtra-413 106 |
| 260. State Bank of India,
Pimpri Town Branch,
Dr. Ambedkar Road,
Pimpri Colony,
Pune-411 017 | 273. State Bank of India,
Uruli Kanchan Branch,
"Ganga Vaibhav",
Ashram Road, Taluka Haveli, Pune,
Maharashtra-412 202 |
| 261. State Bank of India,
Daund Branch,
Dist. Pune.
Maharashtra-413 801 | 274. State Bank of India,
Agri. Dev. Branch, (Junnar),
Distt. Pune,
Maharashtra-410 502 |
| 262. State Bank of India,
Dehu Road,
Near Dehu Road,
Railway Station,
Dist. Pune.
Pin. No-412 101 | 275. State Bank of India,
University Road Branch, Pune,
Veer Chaphekar Chowk,
Pune, Maharashtra-411 016 |

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>276. State Bank of India,
Alandi Branch,
Main Road, Khed Taluka,
Distt. Pune
Pin No-412 105</p> <p>277. State Bank of India,
Ambavane S. A. Branch,
Tal: Velhe, Distt. Pune
Pin No-412 213</p> <p>278. State Bank of India,
Baramati Branch,
Distt. Pune,
Pin. No-423 102</p> <p>279. State Bank of India,
Pune City Branch,
Vijay Chambers, 1379, Sadashiv Peth,
Next to Bharat Natya Mandir,
Pune, Maharashtra-411 030</p> <p>280. State Bank of India,
Manchar Branch,
Near S.T. Stand, Pune-Nasik Road,
Ambegaon Taluka,
Pin No-410 503</p> <p>281. State Bank of India,
Rajgurunagar Branch,
Khed Taluka, Distt. Pune,
Maharashtra-410 505</p> <p>282. State Bank of India,
SPB Bund Garden (Pune) Branch,
Bund Garden Grace Building,
Dhole-Patil Road,
Pune-411001</p> <p>283. State Bank of India,
Industrial Estate, Lonavala Branch,
Nagargaon, Lonavala,
Distt. Pune
Pin No-410 401</p> <p>284. State Bank of India,
Zonal Office, Pune,
"Gulmohor"
2420, East Street Camp,
Pune-411 001</p> <p>285. State Bank of India,
Service Branch (Pune),
Bhausaheb Shirole Bhavan
PMT Building, 5th Floor,
Deccan Gymkhana,
Pune-411004</p> <p>286. State Bank of India,
SPBB, Deccan Gymkhana, Pune
Kumar Renaissance,
Deccan Gymkhana
Pune-411 004</p> | <p>287. State Bank of India,
Deccan Gymkhana, Pune
Deccan Gymkhana,
Pune-411004</p> <p>288. State Bank of India,
Erandavana Branch
Opp. SNTD College,
Karve Road,
Pune-411 004</p> <p>289. State Bank of India,
Nasik Branch,
Old Agra Road, Nasik
Maharashtra-422 002</p> <p>290. State Bank of India,
Tilak Road Branch, Pune
Commercial Building,
Tilak Road, Pune
Maharashtra-411 002</p> <p>291. State Bank of India,
Pune Main Branch, Pune
P.B. No. 06
Collector Office Compound
Pune-411 001</p> <p>292. State Bank of India,
East Street Branch, Pune
2420, Gulmohar Building,
East Street, Pune-411001</p> <p>293. State Bank of India,
Bandra Kurla Complex Branch,
Plot No. C-6, 'G' Block,
Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051</p> <p>294. State Bank of India,
Zonal Office, Nagpur,
P. Box No. 37,
S. V. Patel Marg, Nagpur-440001</p> <p>295. State Bank of India,
Deendyalnagar Branch,
Trimurtinagar, Nagpur-440022</p> <p>296. State Bank of India,
ADB Sakoli, Sakoli,
Distt. - Bhandara, Maharashtra</p> <p>297. State Bank of India,
Jawahar Nagar Ord. Fact. Branch,
Jawaharnagar, Teh. & Distt. - Bhandara
Maharashtra</p> <p>298. State Bank of India,
Bhandara Branch,
Krishnapura Ward, Main Road,
Bhandara, Maharashtra</p> <p>299. State Bank of India,
Gobarwahi Branch,
Teh. Tumsar, Distt. Bhandara,
Maharashtra</p> |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 300. State Bank of India,
Tumsar Branch, Tumsar,
Distt.-Bhandara, Maharashtra | 312. State Bank of India,
Dongaon Branch,
Dongaon, Teh-Mehkar,
Distt.-Buldhana, Maharashtra |
| 301. State Bank of India,
Vayusena Nagar Branch,
Chief Maintenance Command,
Vayusena, Vayusena Nagar,
Nagpur | 313. State Bank of India,
Undri Branch,
Undri, Teh-Chikhali,
Distt.-Buldhana, Maharashtra |
| 302. State Bank of India,
Jaiprakash Nagar Branch,
Tapovan Complex,
Jaiprakash Nagar, Nagpur | 314. State Bank of India,
Shendala Branch,
Post-Naygaon Dattipur,
Teh-Mehkar, Distt.-Buldhana-443301
Maharashtra |
| 303. State Bank of India,
Cement Nagar Branch,
Post-Cement Nagar,
Teh & Distt.-Chandrapur,
Maharashtra. | 315. State Bank of India,
Malkapur Branch,
Buldhana Road, Malkapur,
Distt.-Buldhana, Maharashtra |
| 304. State Bank of India,
Gadchiroli Branch,
Madhumandakini Building,
Mool Road, Gadchiroli,
Maharashtra | 316. State Bank of India,
Chikhali Branch,
Near Shivaji Statue,
Khamgaon Road Chikhali,
Distt.-Buldhana,
Maharashtra-443201 |
| 305. State Bank of India,
Kamptee Branch,
Jabalpur Road, Kamptee,
Distt.-Nagpur, Maharashtra-441001 | 317. State Bank of India,
Buldhana Branch,
Chikhali Road, Buldhana,
Maharashtra |
| 306. State Bank of India,
Narkhed Branch,
Narkhed, Distt.-Nagpur | 318. State Bank of India,,
Mangrulpir Branch,
Mangrulpir, Distt.-Washim,
Maharashtra |
| 307. State Bank of India,
Koradi Branch,
Kamptee Road, Koradi,
Distt.-Nagpur, Maharashtra-411111 | 319. State Bank of India,,
Murtizapur Branch,
Murtizapur, Distt.-Akola,
Maharashtra-444107 |
| 308. State Bank of India,
Ballarpur Branch,
Kachhela Complex,
Opp. Bus Stand Ballarpur,
Distt.-Chandrapur,
Maharashtra-444701 | 320. State Bank of India,,
Kamargaon Branch,
Teh-Karanja (Lad),
Distt.-Washim,
Maharashtra |
| 309. State Bank of India,
M.I.D.C. Buti Bori Branch,
Plot No. 19, M.I.D.C.,
Opp. Police Station, Buti-Bori,
Distt.-Nagpur, Maharashtra-441108 | 321. State Bank of India,,
Mahan Branch,
Post-Mahan, Teh-Barshi Takli
Distt.-Akola,
Maharashtra |
| 310. State Bank of India,
Hirdav SA Branch,
Hirdav, Teh-Lonar,
Distt.-Buldhana, Maharashtra | 322. State Bank of India,,
Tiosa Branch,
Tiosa, Distt.-Amaravati,
Maharashtra |
| 311. State Bank of India,
Kingaon Jattu SA Branch
Post-Kingaon Jattu, Teh-Lonar,
Distt.-Buldhana,
Maharashtra | 323. State Bank of India,,
Dastur Nagar Branch,
Dastur Nagar, Amaravati,
Maharashtra |

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>324. State Bank of India,
Kurha Branch,
Kurha, Teh.—Tiosa,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>325. State Bank of India,
Morshi Branch,
Morshi, Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra</p> <p>326. State Bank of India,
Talegaon (Dashasar) Branch,
Teh.—Dhamangaon Railway,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>327. State Bank of India,
Mangrul Chawala SAB,
Teh.—Nandgaon Khadeshvar,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra-444 729</p> <p>328. State Bank of India,
Amla SA Branch,
Via-Khalapur, Teh.—Daryapur,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra-444 802</p> <p>329. State Bank of India,
Ghuikhed SA Branch,
Ghuikhed, Teh.—Chandur Railway,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>330. State Bank of India,
Chandur Railway Branch,
Chandur Railway, Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra</p> <p>331. State Bank of India,
Dhamangaon Railway ADB
Bhagat Singh Chowk,
Dhamangaon Railway, Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra</p> <p>332. State Bank of India,
Achalpur Branch,
Civil Lines Paratwada,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra-444 805</p> <p>333. State Bank of India,
Amaravati Camp Branch,
Tapovan Road, Amaravati Camp,
Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>334. State Bank of India,
Talegaon (Thakur) Branch,
Talegaon, Teh.—Tiosa,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>335. State Bank of India,
Semadoh SAB,
Semadoh, Teh.—Chikhaldara,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>336. State Bank of India,
Anjansing Branch,
Anjansing, Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra</p> | <p>337. State Bank of India,
Walgaon Branch,
Walgaon, Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra</p> <p>338. State Bank of India,
Palaskhed SA Branch,
Palaskhed, Teh.—Chandur Railway,
Dist.—Amaravati-444 904</p> <p>339. State Bank of India,
Dhamak SAB,
Dhamak, Teh.—Nandgaon Khadeshvar,
Dist.—Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> <p>340. State Bank of India,
Ramtirth SA Branch,
Ramtirth, Teh.—Daryapur,
Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra-444 802</p> <p>341. State Bank of India,
Dharni Branch,
Main Road, Dharni,
Dist.—Amaravati,
Maharashtra-444 702</p> <p>342. State Bank of India,
Hinganghat Branch
Dist.—Wardha,
Maharashtra-442 301</p> <p>343. State Bank of India,
Giroli Branch,
Giroli, Teh.—Deoli,
Dist.—Wardha, Maharashtra</p> <p>344. State Bank of India,
Chikhali (Bhandegaon) Branch,
Chikhali, Teh.—Daryaha
Dist.—Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>345. State Bank of India,
Digras Branch Shivaji Nagar,
Opp. Town Hall, Digras,
Dist.—Yavatmal,
Maharashtra</p> <p>346. State Bank of India,
Harsul Branch, Vill & Post—Harsul
Teh.—Digras, Dist.—Yavatmal,
Maharashtra</p> <p>347. State Bank of India,
Nimbha SA Branch,
Vill & Post—Nimbha,
Teh.—Samudrapur, Dist.—Wardha,
Maharashtra</p> <p>348. State Bank of India,
ADB Amaravati Branch,
Malviya Chowk,
Old Cotten Market,
Amaravati, Maharashtra</p> |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 349. State Bank of India,
ADB Achalpur Branch,
Vaidhya Bhavan, Partwada,
Dist.-Amaravati, Maharashtra | 362. State Bank of India,
P. B. Wardhaman Nagar Branch,
230, Jigar Palace,
Wardhaman Nagar (East)
Nagpur-440 008 |
| 350. State Bank of India,
Chandur Bazar Branch,
Chandur Bazar,
Dist.-Amaravati, Maharashtra | 363. State Bank of India,
P. B. Ramdaspath Branch,
Thaper Enclave, University Road
Ramdaspath, Nagpur |
| 351. State Bank of India,
Amaravati Main Branch,
Maharshi Dayanand Sarsvati Road,
Shyam Chowk, Amaravati,
Maharashtra-444 601 | 364. State Bank of India,
Dusarbid SAB,
Dusarbid, Teh-Sinderkhed
Dist-Buldhana,
Maharashtra-443 308 |
| 352. State Bank of India,
Daryapur Branch,
Daryapur, Dist.-Amaravati,
Maharashtra | 365. State Bank of India,
ADB Bibi Branch,
Bibi, Teh-Lonar,
Dist-Buldhana,
Maharashtra-443 209 |
| 353. State Bank of India,
Kenwad SA Branch, Kenwad,
Teh.-Malegaon, Dist.-Washim,
Maharashtra | 366. State Bank of India,
Shegaon Branch,
Dist-Buldhana, Maharashtra |
| 354. State Bank of India,
Akola Treasury Branch,
Shastri Nagar, Akola,
Maharashtra | 367. State Bank of India,
Amdapur Branch,
Amdapur, Teh. Chikhali,
Dist-Buldhana, Maharashtra |
| 355. State Bank of India,
Manora Branch,
Manora, Dist.-Washim,
Maharashtra | 368. State Bank of India,
ADB Akola Branch,
Jatharpeth, Akola, Maharashtra |
| 356. State Bank of India,
Akola Old City Branch,
Near Jaihind Chowk,
Old City Akola, Maharashtra | 369. State Bank of India,
ADB Akot Branch,
Akot, Dist- Akola, Maharashtra |
| 357. State Bank of India,
ADB Balapur Branch,
Guni Chowk, Balapur,
Dist.-Akola, Maharashtra | 370. State Bank of India,
Malegaon Branch,
Malegaon, Dist-Washim,
Maharashtra |
| 358. State Bank of India,
Paras Branch,
Vidhyutnagar Paras,
Teh. Balapur, Dist.-Akola,
Maharashtra-444 109 | 371. State Bank of India,
Barshi Takli Branch,
Bobde Niwas, Barshi Takli,
Dist.-Akola, Maharashtra |
| 359. State Bank of India,
Sasti SA Branch,
Vill & Post-Sasti, Teh. Patur,
Dist.-Akola, Maharashtra-444 501 | 372. State Bank of India,
Akoli Jahagir SAB,
Akoli Jahagir, Teh-Akot,
Dist-Akola, Maharashtra |
| 360. State Bank of India,
Risod Branch,
Post & Teh. Risod,
Dist.-Washim, Maharashtra | 373. State Bank of India,
Balapur Branch,
Gujratipura, Balapur,
Dist.-Akola,
Maharashtra-444 302 |
| 361. State Bank of India,
Gandhi Grain Market Branch,
Old Bagadganj Tele. Exch. Chowk,
Central Avenu, Maharashtra | 374. State Bank of India,
Vyala S.A. Branch,
Vyala, Dist.-Akola,
Maharashtra |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>375. State Bank of India,
Dhaba S.A. Branch,
Dhaba, Teh-Barshi Takli
Dist.-Akola, Maharashtra-444 001</p> <p>376. State Bank of India,
Karnja Branch,
Near Mulji Jetha School,
Karnja, Dist.-Washim Maharashtra</p> <p>377. State Bank of India,
Akola Main Branch,
Jawaharlal Nehru Marg,
Akola Maharashtra</p> <p>378. State Bank of India,
Ramdaspath Branch Akola
Old Birla Road,
Ramdaspath, Akola,
Maharashtra</p> <p>379. State Bank of India,
Arvi Branch
Dervada Road, Arvi,
Dist.-Wardha, Maharashtra</p> <p>380. State Bank of India,
Wani Branch
Wani, Dist.-Yavatmal,
Maharashtra-445 304</p> <p>381. State Bank of India,
Shindola SA Branch
Shindola, Teh.-Wani,
Dist.-Yavatmal,
Maharashtra-444 307</p> <p>382. State Bank of India,
Naygaon SA Branch
Naygaon, Teh.-Wani
Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>383. State Bank of India,
Kayar SA Branch,
Kayar, Teh.-Wani,
Dist.-Yavatmal,
Maharashtra-445 304</p> <p>384. State Bank of India,
Mukutban Branch,
Mukutban, Teh.-Jhari,
Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>385. State Bank of India,
Patanburi Branch,
Patanburi, Teh.-Kelapur
Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>386. State Bank of India,
Pandharkavada Branch
Pandharkavada, Teh.-Kelapur
Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>387. State Bank of India,
Savarkhed Branch
Savarkhed, Teh.-Ralegaon
Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> | <p>388. State Bank of India,
Sarvari Branch
Sarvari, Teh.Kernja
Dist.-Wardha, Maharashtra</p> <p>389. State Bank of India,
Dhanki Branch
Dhanki, Teh-Umarkhed
Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>390. State Bank of India,
Pusad Branch
Pusad, Dist.-Yavatmal, Maharashtra</p> <p>391. State Bank of India,
Vadhona Branch
Vadhona, Teh.-Arvi
Dist.-Wardha, Maharashtra</p> <p>392. State Bank of India,
Dutt Chowk Yavatmal Branch
Sankatmochan Marg,
Yavatmal, Maharashtra-445 101</p> <p>393. State Bank of India,
Gopal Nagar Branch, (Nagpur),
Jagdish Sabhagrigh, Ranapratap Road,
Nagpur-440 022</p> <p>394. State Bank of India,
NEERI Branch, (Nagpur),
National Environment Engineering
Research Institute
Jawahar Road, Nagpur</p> <p>395. State Bank of India,
Ambazari Branch, (Nagpur),
Plot No. 373, North Ambazari Road,
Gandhinagar, Nagpur-440 010</p> <p>396. State Bank of India,
Ravinagar Branch, (Nagpur),
Annapoorna Arked,
Opposite Agrasen Hostel
Amaravati Road,
Ravinagar
Nagpur-440 022</p> <p>397. State Bank of India,
Chhapru Nagar Branch, (Nagpur),
Khandvani Chamber,
Ambedkar Chowk,
Central Avenue Road,
Nagpur</p> <p>398. State Bank of India,
Rail Trolli Gondia Branch
Rail Trolli,
Gondia Maharashtra</p> <p>399. State Bank of India,
Amgaon AD Branch
Amgaon, Distt. Gondia,
Maharashtra</p> |
|--|--|

- | | |
|---|--|
| 400. State Bank of India,
Shelsur SA Branch,
Vill & Post. Shelsur
Teh. Chikhali, Distt. Buldhana
Maharashtra | 412. State Bank of India,
Panchpaoli Branch,
Keshav Bhavan, Kamthi Road,
Nagpur-440017 |
| 401. State Bank of India,
Kelwad Branch
Viththal Niwas, Kelwad
Distt. Buldhana, Maharashtra | 413. State Bank of India,
Itwari Branch,
Itwari, Nagpur-440 002 |
| 402. State Bank of India,
Mehkar AD Branch
Opposite Soman Jeen
Mehkar, Distt. Buldhana,
Maharashtra | 414. State Bank of India,
Mahal Branch,
Gandhisagar,
Mahal, Nagpur-440 032 |
| 403. State Bank of India,
Dhamangaon Badhe Branch
Vill & Post. Dhamangaon Badhe
Teh. Motala, Distt. Buldhana,
Maharashtra | 415. State Bank of India,
Central Avenue Road Branch,
Central Avenue Road,
Nagpur-440018 |
| 404. State Bank of India,
Janephal Branch
V & Post. Janephal
Teh. Mehkar, Distt. Buldhana
Maharashtra | 416. State Bank of India,
Dharampeth Branch,
West High Court Road,
Nagpur-440 010 |
| 405. State Bank of India,
Lakhanwada Branch
Lakhanwada, Teh. Khamgaon
Distt. Buldhana, Maharashtra | 417. State Bank of India,
Ramdaspath Branch
Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru Marg,
Wardha Road, Nagpur-440 012 |
| 406. State Bank of India,
Khamgaon Branch
Anupam Pharshi Road,
Khamgaon, Distt. Buldhana
Maharashtra | 418. State Bank of India,
Surendranagar Branch,
Plot No. 244,
Surendranagar, Nagpur |
| 407. State Bank of India,
Pimpalgaon Raja Branch
V & Post Pimpalgaon Raja
Teh. Khamgaon, Distt. Buldhana
Maharashtra | 419. State Bank of India,
Coal Estate Branch,
Seminary Hills, Nagpur |
| 408. State Bank of India,
Nagpur Main Branch,
S. V. Patel Marg, Nagpur-440 001 | 420. State Bank of India,
V.R.O.E. Branch,
North Ambazari Marg, Nagpur |
| 409. State Bank of India,
Service Branch, (Nagpur),
5th Floor, Shri Mohini Complex,
S. V. Patel Marg,
Nagpur-440 001 | 421. State Bank of India,
Jamb Branch,
Jamb, Teh.-Tumsar,
Dist.-Bhandara,
Maharashtra |
| 410. State Bank of India,
Medical College Area Branch,
Medical College area
Nagpur-440 009 | 422. State Bank of India,
Ekodi, S.A. Branch,
Ekodi, Teh. Sakoli,
Dist.-Bhandara,
Maharashtra |
| 411. State Bank of India,
Chaoni Branch, Chaoni,
Nagpur-440 013 | 423. State Bank of India,
Sangadi Branch,
Post-Sangadi, Teh.-Sakoli,
Dist.-Bhandara,
Maharashtra |
| | 424. State Bank of India,
Koka S.A. Branch,
Post-Koka, Teh.-Bhandara,
Dist.-Bhandara, Maharashtra |

- | | |
|---|---|
| 425. State Bank of India,
Sakoli Branch,
Sakoli, Dist.-Bhandara
Maharashtra | 438. State Bank of India,
Kanhani Khandelwal Nagar Branch,
J.N. Road, Kanhani,
Dist.-Nagpur |
| 426. State Bank of India,
Paradsinga Branch,
Post-Paradsinga,
Tah. Katol, Dist.-Nagpur | 439. State Bank of India,
Chatgaon Branch,
Post-Chatgaon, Tah.-Dhanora,
Dist. Garichioli,
Maharashtra |
| 427. State Bank of India,
Lakhamapur S.A. Branch,
Post-Lakhamapur,
Tah.-Korapna, Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra | 440. State Bank of India,
Mendaki Branch,
Mendaki, Tah.-Brahmapuri,
Dist.-Chandrapur, Maharashtra |
| 428. State Bank of India,
Warora Branch
Post-Warora, Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra | 441. State Bank of India,
Chandrapur Main Branch,
Kasturba Road,
Chandrapur, Maharashtra-442 402 |
| 429. State Bank of India,
Warasa Branch
Post-Warasa, Dist.-Gadchiroli
Maharashtra | 442. State Bank of India,
Wadhona S.A. Branch,
Post.-Wadhona
Tah.-Nagbhid, Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra |
| 430. State Bank of India,
Talodhi Balapur Branch
Post-Talodhi Balapur,
Tah.-Nagbhir, Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra | 443. State Bank of India,
Forest Camp MIDC Branch,
Ghugus Road, Chandrapur
Maharashtra |
| 431. State Bank of India,
Katol Branch
Nehru Bazar, Katol
Dist.-Nagpur, Maharashtra | 444. State Bank of India,
Mouda Branch,
Post-Mouda, Dist.-Nagpur |
| 432. State Bank of India,
Umred Branch,
Post/Tah.-Umrer
Dist.-Nagpur-441 203 | 445. State Bank of India,
Kurkheda Branch,
PO & Tah.-Kurkheda,
Dist.-Gadchiroli, Maharashtra |
| 433. State Bank of India,
Rajola S.A. Branch,
Post-Rajola, Tah.-Kuhi,
Dist.-Nagpur-441 202 | 446. State Bank of India,
Gadchandur Branch,
Post-Gadchandur,
Tah.-Korapna, Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra |
| 434. State Bank of India,
Chaphegari S.A. Branch,
Post-Chaphegari, Tah.-Kuhi,
Dist.-Nagpur-441 202 | 447. State Bank of India,
Yetapalli Branch,
Post-Yetapalli,
Dist.-Gadchiroli,
Maharashtra |
| 435. State Bank of India,
Gondia Main Branch,
Near Agrasen Bhavan,
Gondia, Maharashtra | 448. State Bank of India,
Saori Bidkar S.A. Branch,
Post-Saori Bidkar
Tah.-Warora, Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra |
| 436. State Bank of India,
Tharipaoni Branch,
Post-Tharipaoni,
Tah.-Narkhed, Dist.-Nagpur | 449. State Bank of India,
Bhadravati Ordinance Factory Branch,
Post-Bhadravati,
Dist.-Chandrapur,
Maharashtra |
| 437. State Bank of India,
Balapur S.A. Branch,
Post.-Balapur,
Tah.-Nagbhir,
Dist.-Chandrapur
Maharashtra | |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 450. State Bank of India,
Ramtek Branch,
Gandhi Chowk, Ramtek
Dist. Nagpur | 462. State Bank of India,
Palsi Branch, Khamgaon
Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 451. State Bank of India,
Shastrinagar Branch,
Gulshan Palace, Mul Road,
Shastrinagar,
Chandrapur Maharashtra | 463. State Bank of India,
Khamgaon A.D. Branch,
Khamgaon, Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 452. State Bank of India,
Industrial Estate Branch,
Pattiwar Bldg., Civil Lines,
Chandrapur, Maharashtra-442 401 | 464. State Bank of India,
Sakharkherda Branch,
Sakharkherda Tah-Sindkhedraja,
Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 453. State Bank of India,
Chandrapur Branch,
Dr. Khan Bhavan,
Ramnagar,
Chandrapur
Maharashtra-442 401 | 465. State Bank of India,
Pimpalgaon Devi S.A. Branch,
Post-Pimpalgaon Devi,
Tah. -Motala, Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 454. State Bank of India,
Jalgaon Jamod A.D. Branch,
Post-Jalgaon Jamod,
Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra. | 466. State Bank of India,
Motala Branch,
Motala, Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 455. State Bank of India,
Jalgaon Jamod Branch
Post/Tah. -Jalgaon Jamod
Dist. -Buldana, Maharashtra | 467. State Bank of India,
Nandura Branch,
Nandura, Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 456. State Bank of India,
Sonala Branch,
Sonala, Tah-Sangrampur
Dist. -Buldana, Maharashtra | 468. State Bank of India,
Malkapur Pangra Branch,
Post/Tah. -Sindkhed Raja
Distt. -Buldana,
Maharashtra |
| 457. State Bank of India,
Pophali S.L. Branch,
Pophali, Tah-Motala
Dist. -Buldana, Maharashtra | 469. State Bank of India,
Tiroda Branch,
Lala Chowk, Main Road,
Tiroda, Dist. -Gondia,
Maharashtra |
| 458. State Bank of India,
Dhad Branch,
Dhad, Dist. -Buldana,
Maharashtra | 470. State Bank of India,
Paoni Branch,
Somwari Ward, Paoni
Distt. -Bhandara,
Maharashtra |
| 459. State Bank of India,
Malkapur A.D. Branch,
Malkapur, Distt. -Buldana,
Maharashtra. | 471. State Bank of India,
Mundri S.A. Branch,
Mundri, Teh. -Mohadi
Distt. -Bhandara,
Maharashtra |
| 460. State Bank of India,
Lonar Branch,
Post/Tah-Lonar
Mehkar Road, Dist. -Buldana
Maharashtra | 472. State Bank of India,
S.I.B. Branch,
Sanjay Place, Agra
Uttar Pradesh-282 002 |
| 461. State Bank of India,
Mehkar Branch,
Post-Mehkar, Dist. -Buldana
Maharashtra | 473. State Bank of India,
Specialised Small Industry Branch,
Samad Road, Aligarh,
Uttar Pradesh. -202 001. |

VIJAYA BANK
HEAD OFFICE
BANGALORE

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Vijaya Bank
H.S.R. Layout, B'lore-1405 (M)
No. 7, 17th Cross,
Sector No. 7
H.S.R. Lay Out,
Bangalore-560 034
Karnataka State</p> <p>2. Vijaya Bank
B.T.M. Layout-1406(M)
No. 23, Shiva Arcade,
29th Main, 1st Stage,
B.T.M. Layout,
Bangalore-560 078
Karnataka State</p> <p>3. Vijaya Bank
Giri Nagar-1407(M)
No. 5, 50 Feet Road,
Avalahalli Extension,
Giri Nagar,
Bangalore-560 026
Karnataka State</p> <p>4. Vijaya Bank
Oxford School Campus
10th Cross, J.P. Nagar, I Phase,
Bangalore-560 078
Karnataka State</p> <p>5. Vijaya Bank
MSRIT, Bangalore-1412(M)
M.S. Ramaiah Institute of Technology,
Gokul, Mathikere,
Bangalore-560 054
Karnataka State</p> <p>6. Vijaya Bank
Vidyaranyapura 1414
No. 735/51/2
Nanjappa Main Road,
Vidyaranyapura,
Bangalore-560 097
Karnataka State</p> <p>7. Vijaya Bank
Dayananda Sagar College of Engineering,
Bangalore,
Kumarswamy Layout,
Karnataka State-560 078</p> <p>8. Vijaya Bank
Tezpur-8005(S)
P. B. No. 29, Main Road,
Tezpur-784 001
Assam</p> | <p>9. Vijaya Bank
Silchar-8006(U)
P. B. No. 27
Shillong Patty,
Shyamprasad Road,
Silchar-788 001
Assam</p> <p>10. Vijaya Bank
Sibsagar-8009
Bharali Commercial Complex,
1st floor, Hospital Road,
Sibsagar-785 640
Assam</p> <p>11. Vijaya Bank
Maligaon-8010(U)
1st floor, Kunja Plaza
Commercial Complex,
Maligaon, Chariali,
Maligaon, Guwahati,
Kamrup Dist.
Assam State
Pincode-781 012</p> <p>12. Vijaya Bank
Kohima-8101(S)
P. B. No. 20
Circular Road,
Dimapur,
Nagaland State
Pincode-797 112</p> <p>13. Vijaya Bank
Dimapur-8102(S)
P. B. No. 20
Circular Road,
Dimapur,
Nagaland State
Pincode-797 112</p> <p>14. Vijaya Bank
Nagimora-8103(R)
Main Road,
Nagimora,
Mon Dist.
Nagaland State
Pincode-798 622</p> <p>15. Vijaya Bank
G.S. Road, 8501(U)
P. B. No. 18
G.S. Road,
Shillong,
Meghalaya
Pincode-793 001</p> |
|--|---|

16. Vijaya Bank
Laitumkhrah-8502(S)
P. B. No. 1
Opp. Post Office,
Laitumkhrah,
Sillong, Meghalaya
Pincode-793 003
17. Vijaya Bank
Kukatpally-4083(U)
Plot No. C & D
Jayabharat Nagar,
Nizampet Road,
KPHB Colony,
Rangareddy Dist.,
Hyderabad-500 072
18. Vijaya Bank
Jubilee Hills-4084(U)
A-33 Film Nagar,
Road No. 5,
Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad Dist.
Hyderabad-500 033
19. Vijaya Bank
Gandhinagar-4085
D. No. 1-4-879/42/6/A/1
Opp. Surya Residency,
Bakaram,
Hyderabad-500 080
20. Vijaya Bank
Aluva-2069(S)
Mukkath Plaza
Bypass Junction,
Aluva,
Kerala State
Pincode-683 101
21. Vijaya Bank
Vyttila-2070(U)
Simson Towers, S.A. Road,
Vyttila, Ernakulam,
Kerala
Pincode-682 019
22. Vijaya Bank
Vellayambalam-2071
Akshaya Towers,
TC-9-1494
Sasthamangalam Junction,
Thiruvananthapuram,
Kerala
Pincode-695 010
23. Vijaya Bank
Currency Chest Kundotty-9616
RS/83/3 Nediurappu Village
Kundotty, Malappuram Dist,
Kerala
24. Vijaya Bank
Currency Chest Tiruvalla-9620
Vengal Building
Cross Junction
Tiruvalla-689 101
25. Vijaya Bank
Subramanya-1409(R)
Post Subramanya
Sullia Taluk
D. K. District
Karnataka State
Pincode-574 238
26. Vijaya Bank
Bhogadi, Mysore-1413
No. 1545
Sahukar Chennaiah Road
Bhogadi, 2nd Stage
Mysore, Karnataka
Pincode-570 009
27. Vijaya Bank
Vijayanagar-1415
New Kalidasa Road
Vijayanagar 1st Stage
Mysore-570 017
28. Vijaya Bank
Currency Chest Shimoga-9615
'HARSHA ARCADE'
Sharavathinagar
Sagar Road
Shimoga-577 201
29. Vijaya Bank
Currency Chest Udupi-9618
'VISHNU PRIYA'
LBS Mard, Ajjarkad
Udupi-576 101 D.K.
30. Vijaya Bank
Kumbhashi-1408 (R)
No. 1/54, N.H. 17
Anegudde, Kumbhashi
Kundapur Taluk
Udupi Dist., Karnataka
Pincode-576 257
31. Vijaya Bank
Benz Circle, Vijayawada-4080(U)
D. No. 40-1/52/6
Near Benz Circle
M. G. Road, Vijayawada
Andhra Pradesh
Pincode-520010
32. Vijaya Bank
Dwarkanagar-4082
D. No. 48-9-19
Pavan Towers
Dwarkanagar
Visakhapatnam-530 016

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>33. Vijaya Bank
Chirala-4081
Door No. 14-1-148(2)
Bipin Villa
Municipal Office Road
Chirala-523 155
Prakasam Dist. A.P.</p> <p>34. Vijaya Bank
Siliguri-7207(U)
Ground Floor
Nanak Sevok Road
Siliguri, West Bengal
Pincode-734401</p> <p>35. Vijaya Bank
Dharamtolla-7211(M)
No. 37/1
N.C. Street
Dharamtolla
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700013</p> <p>36. Vijaya Bank
Brabourne Road-7213(M)
P. B. No. 2038
1/2, Old Court House
Brabourne Road
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700001</p> <p>37. Vijaya Bank
Jagannathpur-7215(R)
Jagannathpur
Barasat, 1st Floor
North 24, Paraganas Dist.
West Bengal
Pincode-743201</p> <p>38. Vijaya Bank
Overseas, Kolkata-7216(M)
First Floor
A.G. Towers
125/1, Park Street
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700017</p> <p>39. Vijaya Bank
N.S. Road (new)-7218(M)
First Floor, Mukti Chambers
No. 4, Cliverow
N.S. Road, Kolkata
Pincode-700001</p> <p>40. Vijaya Bank
Gora Bazar-7221(S)
95, Dr. S.P. Mukherjee Road
Gora Bazar
Dum Dum Cantt.
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700028</p> | <p>41. Vijaya Bank
Rashbehari Avenue-7222(M)
First Floor
No. 175
Sarat Bose Road
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700026</p> <p>42. Vijaya Bank
Shyam Bazar-7223(M)
54/A, First Floor
Bhupen Bose Avenue
Shyam Bazar
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700004</p> <p>43. Vijaya Bank
Sealdah-7224(M)
53-ABC, Tower Plaza
Surya Sent Street
Near Mitra High School
Sealdah, Kolkata,
West Bengal
Pincode-700009</p> <p>44. Vijaya Bank
Salt Lake,
Kolkata-7226(U)
DA 31, Sector-1
Salt Lake
Kolkata, West Bengal
Pincode-700064</p> <p>45. Vijaya Bank
New Market-7227
No. 53-D, Mirza Galib Street
New Market
Kolkata-700016</p> <p>46. Vijaya Bank
Berhampur-7402(U)
No. 142
Hanuman Bazar Road
Berhampur
Ganjam Dist., Orissa
Pincode-760002</p> <p>47. Vijaya Bank
Sambalpur-7406(U)
Indsor Complex
V.S.S. Marg
Sakhi Gopinath
Sambalpur, Orissa
Pincode-768001</p> <p>48. Vijaya Bank
Haridwar-7142
8, Govindpuri Main Road
Near Chandracharya Chowk
Haridwar-249 401
Uttaranchal State</p> |
|--|--|

49. Vijaya Bank
Dlf Phase-1, Gurgaon-8313(M)
Shop No. 19-20
Shopping Mall DLF City
Phase-1, Arjun Marg
DLF Gurgaon,
Haryana-122 002
50. Vijaya Bank
Ambala Cantt-8311(S)
4261-63, Cross No. 2
Nicholson Road
Behind B.D. School
Ambala Cantt, Haryana
Pincode-133001
51. Vijaya Bank
Sonapat-8312(U)
41-44, Subhash Chowk
Municipal Market
Atlas Road, Sonapat,
Haryana-131 001
52. Vijaya Bank
Vikas Marg-6041(M)
No. 8 Rajdhani Enclave
Vikas Marg
New Delhi-110 092
53. Vijaya Bank
Malviyanagar-6042(M)
D-86
Main Road
Malviyanagar
New Delhi-110 017
54. Vijaya Bank
Azadpur-6043(M)
17-18, New Subzi Mandi
Behind Indraprasta Ice & Cold Storage
Azadpur,
Delhi-110033
55. Vijaya Bank
Vidyadhar Nagar-7013(M)
B-5, Dhanshree-II
Central Spine
Vidyadhar Nagar
Jaipur
Rajasthan-302 012
56. Vijaya Bank
City Palace-7014(U)
City Palace
Udaipur
Rajasthan-313 001
57. Vijaya Bank
Greater Noide-7140
Shop No. 7,8,9
Jagath Form Sector
Gamma-C
Greater Noida-201308
Gautam Budha Nagar Dist. U.P.
58. Vijaya Bank
Kota-7016
Plot No. 3
Aerodrome Circle
Kota, Rajasthan
59. Vijaya Bank
Alwar Gate-7018(U)
43, Vijaya Complex
Lajpat Nagar, Jai Marg, Alwar
Rajasthan-301 001
60. Vijaya Bank
S.S. Road,
Indore-7607(M)
No. 32, Sneh Nagar Main
Sapna Sangeeta Road
Indore,
Madhya Pradesh-452 001
61. Vijaya Bank
I.E.T. Mohibullapur-7141(U)
The Institute of Engineer Gen
Ing & Technology
Sitapur Road,
Mohiballapur
Lucknow Dist., UP-226 021
62. Vijaya Bank
UNNAO-7143
309-320 (New)
Mohalla Sahganj
UNNAO-209 801 U.P.
63. Vijaya Bank
Mathura-7144
Tera Tower
Bhuteshwar Road
Mathura-281 001
Uttar Pradesh State
64. Vijaya Bank
Regional Office
Chandigarh-9126
SCO-185-187
Sector-9 C
Chandigarh-U.T.-160 009
65. Vijaya Bank
Manimajra-6044(S)
Sco 37, Pocket No. 1
Manimajra
Chandigarh (UT)-160 017
66. Vijaya Bank
Bhatinda-7510(U)
Sagar's Complex,
Opp : wadi Hospital
Main Guniana Road,
Bhatinda,
Punjab-151 001

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>67. Vijaya Bank
Mandi Govindgarh-7514(S)
Opp. Bus Stand
G.T. Road,
Mandi Gobindgarh
Fategarh Sahib Dist.
Punjab-147 301</p> <p>68. Vijaya Bank
Moga-7511(U)
B.J. Singh Agro Sales Building
G.T. Road
Moga, Punjab-142 001</p> <p>69. Vijaya Bank
B.R.S. Nagar-7512
Ludhiana-141 012</p> <p>70. Vijaya Bank
Batala-7513(S)
B-9, 142/1
G.T. Road
Batala
Gurudaspur, Punjab
Pincode-143 505</p> <p>71. Vijaya Bank
Currency Chest-96 19
No. 2, Neptune House
(Basement) Navrangpura
Ahmedabad-380 009</p> <p>72. Vijaya Bank
Bardoli-7334(S)
Near Janatha Society
Station Road, Bardoli
Surat Dist.,
Gujarat-394601</p> <p>73. Vijaya Bank
Armb Ahmedabad-7335(U)
First Floor
Kamadhenu Complex
Panjarapole, Ambawadi,
Ahmedabad-380 015</p> <p>74. Vijaya Bank
Gandhidham-7338(U)
Plot No. 3,
Sector 1A
Gandhidham, Kutch Dist.
Gujarat</p> <p>75. Vijaya Bank
Chandkheda-7337(S)
Shyamal Complex
100 Feet Road
New G.C. Road, Chandkheda
Ahmedabad, Gujarat-382424</p> <p>76. Vijaya Bank
Sola Cross Road-7336
Navarang Complex
Near Saltadar Circle</p> | <p>Sola Cross Road
Ahmedabad-380 061
Gujarat State</p> <p>77. Vijaya Bank
Chinchwad-5004(U)
Mumbai Pune Road
H.A. Colony, Pimpri
Chinchwad, Pune
Maharashtra-411018</p> <p>78. Vijaya Bank
Link Cell, Nagpur-5068(M)
No. 93-94
Central Avenue Road
Gandhi Bagh
Nagpur, Maharashtra-440018</p> <p>79. Vijaya Bank
Kandivili-W-5070(M)
Panchsheel Heights
90 Ft Road, Mahaveer Nagar
Kandivili-W, Mumbai
Maharashtra-400067</p> <p>80. Vijaya Bank
Dahisar-E-5069(M)
Sai Leela Co-op. Housing Society Ltd.
Anand Nagar, Dahisar-E
Mumbai, Maharashtra-400068</p> <p>81. Vijaya Bank
Versova-5071
Amay House
Ground floor, J.P. Road, Versova
Mumbai-400 058</p> <p>82. Vijaya Bank
Dr. Ambedkar Road,
Bandra (W)-5072
Plot No. 324, Pinnacle Apartment
Junction of Dr. Ambedkar Road and
33rd Village, Bandra (W)
Mumbai-400 050</p> <p>83. Vijaya Bank
Regional Office
Shimoga-9122
1st floor
Opp APMC Guest House, Maharashtra
Sagar Road
Shimoga-577 201
Karnataka</p> <p>84. Vijaya Bank
Regional Office
Udupi-9118
2nd Floor
Shamili Inn
NH 17, Ambalalpady
Udupi-576 103
Karnataka</p> |
|--|--|

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Punjab National Bank,
Branch : Graduate School of Business,
Administration Complex,
Alfa Sector,
Greater Noida, U.P. 2. Punjab National Bank,
Integrated Zonal Office,
Shatabdi Bhavan,
Mini Bypass Road,
P.O. Govindapuram,
Calicut (Kerala),
Pin-673016. 3. Punjab National Bank,
K.P. Kesavamenon Road,
P.B. No. 11, Calicut (Kerala),
Pin-673001 4. Punjab National Bank,
Shatabdi Bhavan,
Service Block,
Mini Bypass Road,
Govindapuram,
Calicut (Kerala),
Pin-673016. 5. Punjab National Bank,
P.B. No. 1013,
OSC Complex,
Manorma Junction,
Nadakkavu,
Calicut (Kerala),
Pin-673011. 6. Punjab National Bank,
Ambedkar Building,
Rly. Station Link Road,
Calicut (Kerala),
Pin-673002. 7. Punjab National Bank,
P.B. No. 132, 5/2521,
Eroth Centre,
Bank Road,
Calicut (Kerala)
Pin-673011. 8. Punjab National Bank,
KTP Towers,
South Bazar,
Kannur (Kerala),
Pin-670002. 9. Punjab National Bank,
Door No. 8/380 L,
Kuttiapuram Road, Edapal,
Distt. Malappuram (Kerala),
Pin-679576. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Punjab National Bank,
KPV Complex,
Jose Theatre Road,
Mananthavady,
Distt. Wynad (Kerala),
Pin-670645. 11. Punjab National Bank,
Rhema Towers,
Main Road, Kalpeta,
Distt. Wynad (Kerala),
Pin-673121. <p style="text-align: center;">Integrated Zonal Office,
Chennai
SRMO, Bangalore</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Punjab National Bank,
Zonal Stationery Centre,
3-4, H-Siddaiah Road,
Bangalore-560002. 13. Punjab National Bank,
380, Kamachi Court,
Sadashivnagar,
Bangalore-560003. 14. Punjab National Bank,
Opp. SSLC Board, 6h Cross,
Malleswaram,
Bangalore-560000. 15. Punjab National Bank,
138, M.C. Road,
Mandya-571401. (Karnataka) 16. Punjab National Bank,
3463/3381, Vidyanagar
1st Cross, B.H. Road
Tumkur 572103. (Karnataka) 17. Punjab National Bank,
Market Road, P.B. No. 1177,
Ernakulam-682011. (Kerala) 18. Punjab National Bank,
Menachery Building,
Bank Junction,
National Highway, Angamaly,
Ernakulam-683572 (Kerala) 19. Punjab National Bank,
Kottukulam Road,
Mattanchery,
Cochin-682002. (Kerala) 20. Punjab National Bank,
Opp. Kairali Apartments,
Near Statue Junction,
Tripunithura-682301. (Kerala) | <p>D. No.</p> <p>4212</p> <p>1062</p> <p>1261</p> <p>2527</p> <p>3032</p> |
|---|---|---|

21. Punjab National Bank,
P.B. No. 1875,
Kathirickadavu,
PO Kaloar, Ernakulam,
South-682017 (Kerala)
22. Punjab National Bank,
35/574-5, Darbar Hall Road,
Ernakulam-South-682016
(Kerala)
23. Punjab National Bank,
Suvarna Park, Main Road,
North Parur-683513 (Kerala)
24. Punjab National Bank,
Kunnath Building, PP Road,
Perumbavoor-683542 (Kerala)

Regional Office,**Trivandrum (Kerala)****Rules, 1976****District Alleppey :**

25. Punjab National Bank,
Mullakkal, Alleppey,
Kerala-688011
26. Punjab National Bank,
Chengannur (Alleppey),
Kerala-689121
27. Punjab National Bank,
Amritha Complex,
Cherthala (Alleppey),
Kerala-688524
28. Punjab National Bank,
NSS Union Building,
Haripad (Alleppey),
Kerala-690574
29. Punjab National Bank,
Parumala Junction,
Mannar (Alleppey),
Kerala-689622
30. Punjab National Bank,
Mavelikara (Alleppey),
Kerala-690101

District Idduki :

31. Punjab National Bank,
Mariyil Towers,
Main Road,
Thodupuzha (Idduki)
Kerala-685584

District Kollam :

32. Punjab National Bank,
Ashramam, Kollam,
Kerala-691001

33. Punjab National Bank,
Chamakada, Kollam,
Kerala-691001
34. Punjab National Bank,
Q.S. Road, Kollam,
Kerala-691001
35. Punjab National Bank,
Thejus Building,
Kottarakara (Kollam),
Kerala-691531

District Kottayam :

36. Punjab National Bank,
M.C. Road,
Chenganacherry (Kottayam),
Kerala-686101
37. Punjab National Bank,
Logos Centre, Kottayam,
Kerala-686001
38. Punjab National Bank,
T.B. Road, Kottayam,
Kerala-686001
39. Punjab National Bank,
Palai (Kottayam),
Kerala-686575

District Pathanamthitta

40. Punjab National Bank,
Thirumala Devaswam Building,
Kozhencherry,
Kerala-689641
41. Punjab National Bank,
M.C. Road, Ramanchira,
Thiruvalla, Kerala-689101
42. Punjab National Bank,
Relish Towers, M.C. Road,
N.R.I., Thiruvalla,
Kerala-689101

District Trichur :

43. Punjab National Bank,
Hassan Sons Complex,
Chavakkad (Trichur),
Kerala-680506
44. Punjab National Bank,
Desamangalam (Trichur),
Kerala-679532
45. Punjab National Bank,
West Nada,
Guruvayoor (Trichur),
Kerala-680101
46. Punjab National Bank,
P.O. Mattom,
Kandanassery (Trichur),
Kerala-680602

47. Punjab National Bank,
Karupadanna (Trichur),
Kerala-680670
48. Punjab National Bank,
P.O. Kozhukully,
Moorkanikkara (Trichur),
Kerala-680752
49. Punjab National Bank,
Pavaratty (Trichur),
Kerala-680507
50. Punjab National Bank,
South Hill Arcade,
Pazhayannur (Trichur),
Kerala-680587
51. Punjab National Bank,
Bazar Road,
Pudukkad (Trichur),
Kerala-680301
52. Punjab National Bank,
Ikarath Building,
Talikulam (Trichur),
Kerala-680569
53. Punjab National Bank,
Kuruppam Road, Trichur,
Kerala-680001
54. Punjab National Bank,
Valapad (Trichur),
Kerala-680567
55. Punjab National Bank,
Vaniampara (Trichur),
Kerala-680652

District Trivandrum :

56. Punjab National Bank,
Medical College,
Trivandrum,
Kerala-695011
57. Punjab National Bank,
Palkulangara,
Trivandrum,
Kerala-695008
58. Punjab National Bank,
Regional Office,
C.P.G.P. Towers,
General Hospital Road,
Statue Junction,
Trivandrum,
Kerala-695001
59. Punjab National Bank,
Railway Station Road,
Trivandrum (Kerala),
Pin Code-695001

60. Punjab National Bank,
Statue Junction,
Trivandrum,
Kerala-695001

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3552—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) योजना, 1970 के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा (3-ज) और (3-क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा डा. (श्रीमती) प्रभा के तवियाड, गोकुल सोसायटी निवासी, चकलिया रोड, दाहोड (गुजरात) को अधिसूचना की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या उनका उत्तराधिकारी नामित किए जाने तक, जो भी पहले हो, बैंक आफ इंडिया के अंशकालिक निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 9/36/2005-बीओ-I]

जी. बी. सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2005

S.O. 3552.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 3(h) and (3-A) of Section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and transfer of undertakings) Act, 1970 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby nominates Dr. (Smt.) Prabha K. Taviad, resident of Gokul Society, Chakaliya Road, Dahod (Gujarat) as part-time non-official director of Bank of India for a period of three years from the date of notification or until her successor is nominated, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 9/36/2005-BO-I]

G. B. Singh, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3553.—निक्षेप बीमा और प्रत्यय गारंटी अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 47) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (2) के खंड (ii) के साथ पठित धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करके एतद्वारा, भारतीय साधारण बीमा निगम के अध्यक्ष श्री आर. के. जोशी को श्री पी.सी. घोष के स्थान पर निक्षेप बीमा और प्रत्यय गारंटी निगम (डीआईसीजीसी) के निदेशक बोर्ड में निदेशक के रूप में अधिसूचना की तारीख से 30-4-2007 अर्थात् उनकी अधिवर्षिता की तारीख तक या अगले आदेश होने तक, जो भी पहले हो नामित करती है।

[फा. सं. 6/1/2005-बीओ-I]

जी. बी. सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2005

S.O. 3553.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) of Section 6 read with clause (ii) of Sub-section 2 of Section 6 of the Deposit Insurance

and Credit Guarantee Corporation Act, 1961 (47 of 1961), the Central Government, in consultation with Reserve Bank of India, hereby nominates Shri R. K. Joshi, Chairman, General Insurance Corporation of India as a Director on the Board of Directors of Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation (DICGC) from the date of notification and up to 30-04-2007, i.e. the date of his superannuation or until further orders, whichever is earlier, vice Shri P. C. Ghosh.

[F. No. 6/1/2005-BO-I]

G. B. Singh, Under Secy..

कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त

उदयपुर, 27 सितम्बर, 2005

सं. 06/27

का.आ. 3554.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खंड (23ग) की उप धारा (vi) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2गक के द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर "भारतीय शिक्षा प्रसार समिति, अजमेर" को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजन हेतु निर्धारण वर्ष 1999-2000 से 2001-02 के लिए अनुमोदन करते हैं।

परन्तु यह तब जब की सोसायटी आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 10 के खंड (23ग) की उपधारा (vi) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2 गक के प्रावधानों की पुष्टि एवं अनुपालना करती है।

[सं. सु.आ.आ./उदय/आ.अ.(प्रशा.)/2005-06/1547]

पी० के० मिश्र, मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त

**OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF
INCOME TAX**

Udaipur, the 27th September, 2005

No. 06/27

S.O. 3554.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (vi) of clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2CA of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, the Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby approves "Bhartiya Shiksha Prasara Samiti, Ajmer" for the purpose of said section for the assessment years 1999-2000 to 2001-02.

Provided that the society conforms to and complies with the provisions of Sub-section (vi) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, read with rule 2CA of the Income-tax Rules, 1962.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO(A)/2005-06/1547]

P. K. MISRA, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3555.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में राजस्व विभाग के अधीन केन्द्रीय उत्पाद एवं सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारीवृंद ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

सीमा शुल्क (निवारक) आयुक्तालय

केन्द्रीय राजस्व भवन,

माल रोड, अमृतसर-143001

[फा. सं. 11013(01)2005-हिन्दी-2]

मधु शर्मा, निदेशक (रा.भा.)

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 28th September, 2005

S.O. 3555.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Language (Use of Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following office under the Board of Central Excise & Customs, Department of Revenue the 80% staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

Commissioner of Customs (Preventive)

Central Revenue Building,

Mall Road,

Amritsar-143001

[F. No. 11013(01)2005-Hindi-2]

MADHU SHARMA, Director (OL)

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3556.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में राजस्व विभाग के अधीन केन्द्रीय उत्पाद एवं सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारीवृंद ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

1. केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क आयुक्तालय, अहमदाबाद-II, अहमदाबाद।
2. केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, मंडल-I, नरोडा, जी.आई.डी.सी. अहमदाबाद।
3. केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, मंडल-II, नरोडा रोड, अहमदाबाद।
4. केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, मंडल-III, ओढव, अहमदाबाद।

5. केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, मंडल-IV, ग्रामीण, अहमदाबाद।

6. केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, मंडल-V, शहरी, अहमदाबाद।

[फा. सं. 11013(01)2005-हिन्दी-2]

मधु शर्मा, निदेशक (रा.भा.)

New Delhi, the 28th September, 2005

S.O. 3556.—In pursuance of Sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices under the Board of Central Excise & Customs, Department of Revenue the 80% staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

1. Commissioner, Central Excise, Ahmedabad-II, Ahmedabad
2. Central Excise Division, Division-I, Naroda, GIDC Ahmedabad.
3. Central Excise Division, Division-II, Naroda Road, Ahmedabad.
4. Central Excise Division, Division-III, Odav, Ahmedabad.
5. Central Excise Division, Division-IV, Rural, Ahmedabad.
6. Central Excise Division, Division-V, Urban, Ahmedabad.

[F. No. 11013(01)2005-Hindi-2]

MADHU SHARMA, Director (OL)

कृषि मंत्रालय

(पशुपालन, डेयरी और मत्स्यपालन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3557.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में पशुपालन, डेयरी और मत्स्यपालन विभाग की अधीनस्थ कार्यालय, भारतीय मात्स्यिकी सर्वेक्षण, पोर्ट ब्लेयर में हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान रखने वाले कर्मचारियों की संख्या 90% से अधिक हो जाने के फलस्वरूप उन्हें एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

[सं. 3-6/2005-हिंदी]

ए० पी० त्यागी, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Animal Husbandry,
Dairying and Fisheries)

New Delhi, the 16th September, 2005

S.O. 3557.—In pursuance of Sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the

Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies Fisheries Survey of India, Port Blair, the subordinate office of the Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying & Fisheries where the percentage of Hindi knowing staff has gone above 90%.

[No. 3-6/2005-Hindi]

A. P. TYAGI, Dy. Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3558.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद से परामर्श करने के बाद उक्त अनुसूची की प्रथम सूची में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अनुसूची में :—

“मान्यता प्राप्त चिकित्सा अर्हता” [इसके बाद कालम (2) के रूप में उल्लिखित] शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत “बनारस हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय” के सामने, “पंजीयन के लिए संक्षिप्त रूप” [इसके बाद कालम (3) के रूप में उल्लिखित] शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत अन्तिम प्रविष्टि तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टि के बाद निम्नलिखित अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

2.	3.
“मजिस्ट्रार चिरुरगी (मूत्र विज्ञान)	एम. सी. एच. (मूत्र-विज्ञान) (यह एक मान्यताप्राप्त चिकित्सा अर्हता होगी यदि यह इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ मेडिकल साइंसेज, वाराणसी में प्रशिक्षित छात्रों के संबंध में 1978 में अथवा उसके बाद प्रदान की गई हो)

[सं. वी-11015/15/2004-एम ई (नोति-1)]

के० वी० एस० राव, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health and Family Welfare)

New Delhi, the 1st September, 2005

S.O. 3558.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (2) of Section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consulting the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following further amendments in the first Schedule to the said Act, namely :—

In the said Schedule—

Against “Banaras Hindu University” under the heading ‘Recognized Medical Qualification [hereinafter referred

to as column (2)] after the last entry and entry relating thereto under the heading 'Abbreviation for Registration' [hereinafter referred to as column (3)] the following shall be inserted, namely :—

2	3
'Magistrar Chirurgiae (Urology)	M.C.h. (Urology) (This shall be a recognized medical qualification when granted on or after 1978 in respect of students trained at Institute of Medical Sciences, Varanasi.

[No. V-11015/15/2004-ME (Policy-I)]

K. V. S. RAO, Under Secy.

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3559.—दन्त चिकित्सा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 16) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय दन्त चिकित्सा परिषद से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम की अनुसूची के भाग-1 में एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

2. राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय (आर. जी. यू.ओ. एच. एस.), बंगलौर के संबंध में दन्त चिकित्सा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 16) की अनुसूची के भाग-1 में क्रम संख्या 49 के सामने कालम 2 तथा 3 की मौजूदा प्रविष्टियों में बी. एस. डेंटल कालेज और हास्पिटल तथा एम. एस. रमैया डेंटल कालेज, बंगलौर के संबंध में उनमें निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां अन्तःस्थापित की जाएंगी :—

XXII. बी. एस. डेंटल कालेज और हास्पिटल, बंगलौर :

"मास्टर ऑफ डेंटल सर्जरी

(i) ओरल पैथालॉजी (यदि 30-4-2005 को अथवा उसके बाद प्रदान की गयी हो)	एम. डी. एस. (ओरल पैथालॉजी) राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, बंगलौर।
(ii) ओरल एवं मैक्सिल्लोफेसियल सर्जरी (यदि 30-4-2005 को अथवा उसके बाद प्रदान की गयी हो)	एम. डी. एस. (ओरल एवं मैक्सिल्लोफेसियल सर्जरी) राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, बंगलौर।
(iii) आर्थोडान्टिक्स (यदि 30-4-2005 को या उसके बाद प्रदान की गयी हो)	एम.डी.एस. (आर्थोडान्टिक्स) राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, बंगलौर"।

XXV. एम. एस. रमैया डेंटल कालेज, बंगलौर :

"मास्टर ऑफ डेंटल सर्जरी

(i) कन्जरवेटिव सर्जरी : (यदि 7-5-2005 को या उसके बाद प्रदान की गयी हो)	एम. डी. एस. (कन्जरवेटिव डेन्टिस्ट्री) राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय बंगलौर"।
---	---

[सं. बी-12017/46/99-पीएमएस]

ए. के. सिंह, अवर सचिव

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 27th September, 2005

S.O. 3559.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Dentists Act, 1948 (16 of 1948), the Central Government, after consultation with Dental Council of India, hereby, makes the following amendments in Part-I of the Schedule to the said Act, namely :—

In the existing entries of column 2 & 3 against Serial No. 49, in Part-I of the Schedule to the Dentists Act, 1948 (16 of 1948) pertaining to Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences (RGUOHS), Bangalore, the following entries in respect of V. S. Dental College & Hospital, Bangalore and M. S. Ramaiah Dental College, Bangalore shall be inserted thereunder :—

XXII V. S. Dental College & Hospital, Bangalore

"Master of Dental Surgery

(i) Oral Pathology (When granted on or after 30-4-2005)	MDS (Oral Pathology) Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore.
(ii) Oral & Maxillo- facial Surgery (When granted on or after 30-4-2005)	MDS (Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery) Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore.
(iii) Orthodontics (When granted on or after 30-4-2005)	MDS (Orthodontics) Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore."

XXV M. S. Ramaiah Dental College, Bangalore

"Master of Dental Surgery

(i) Conservative Dentistry (When granted on or after 7-5-2005)	MDS (Conservative Dentistry) Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore."
---	--

[No. V-12017/46/99-PMS]

A. K. SINGH, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3560.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 768(अ) तारीख 13-05-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से आर.-एल.एन.जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 03-07-2005 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के सम्बन्ध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निदेश देती है कि पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय, पाइपलाइनें बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गाँव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	चिमली	1	0.11
			17	0.05
			18	0.33

1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	चिमली	28/2	0.09
			28/1	0.21
			28/3	0.12
			28/4	0.04
			30/2	0.01
			30/1	0.20
			51/2	0.13
			51/1	0.10
			50	0.27
			54	0.30
			70	0.16
			69/1/2	0.11
			69/1/1	0.23
			69/2	0.28
			72	0.46
			73	0.05
			योग	3.25
		बड़ोदिया खौन	429	0.01
			S532	0.10
			450	0.34
			451/1	0.07
			451/2	0.01
			452/3/1	0.01
			452/3/2	0.04
			487	0.09
			488	0.07
			486	1.57
			493	0.03
			495	0.56
			494	0.14
			496	0.01
			512	0.05
			513	0.19
			515	0.11
			514	0.12
			535/1	0.31
			534	0.33
			533	0.19
			योग	4.35
		पनोड	295/1	0.06
			301	0.07
			302	0.25
			308	0.06
			योग	0.44

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
इन्दौर	सांवेर	कुडाणा	785	0.08	इन्दौर	सांवेर	लक्ष्मण खेड़ी	173/219	0.06	
		(मनोहर खेड़ी)	784	0.15				174	0.02	
			992	0.06				173	0.03	
			774	0.11				175	0.03	
			772	0.03				176	0.32	
			993	0.06				184	0.14	
			995	0.02				183	0.27	
			994	0.33				185	0.01	
			997	0.12				197	0.01	
			770	0.06				195	0.10	
			योग	6.80				196	0.30	
		उगम खेड़ी	1	0.12				193	0.11	
			2	0.01				204	0.02	
			4	0.17				209	0.05	
			5	0.10				192/1	0.01	
			13/1	0.09				210	0.16	
			13/2	0.13				207	0.21	
			13/3	0.22				212	0.03	
			15/4	0.30				169	0.01	
			15/5	0.01				156/1	0.01	
			15/3	0.08				159	0.06	
			17	0.13				161	0.26	
			14	0.11				158	0.15	
			18	0.46				156/3	0.01	
			72	0.04				156/4	0.01	
			25	0.05				157	0.34	
			24	0.18				150	0.21	
			26	0.37				149	0.52	
			49	0.13				144	0.02	
			53	0.23				143	0.21	
			54	0.09				142	0.32	
			55	0.08				216	0.05	
			63	0.14				योग	4.06	
			64	0.01				देवली	164	0.06
			67	0.18					161	0.71
			69	0.15					159	0.02
			197	0.07					158	0.13
			201	0.16					162	0.11
			202	0.18					11	0.01
			6	0.01					12	0.21
			योग	4.00					30	0.39
		सांवेर	880	0.08					31	0.02
			861	0.01					32	0.01
			866/1	0.45					33	0.23
			866/2	0.04					34	0.05
			887	0.03					80	0.32
			868	0.26					79	0.01
			856	0.04					81	0.02
			870	0.05						
			योग	0.96						

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	देवली	86	0.01	इन्दौर	सांवेर	बिरहमन खेड़ी	42/2	0.02
			85	0.16				47	0.02
			84/2	0.37				83	0.14
			84/1	0.03				82	0.15
			87	0.27				81	0.52
			112/2	0.08				77/1	0.11
			112/1	0.10				76	0.02
			111	0.16				75	0.05
			109	0.33				योग	1.78
			110	0.1	इन्दौर	सांवेर	कटक्या	44/5	0.06
			103	0.48				45	0.14
			102	0.02				51	0.24
			125	0.04				46	0.26
			योग	4.36				48	0.16
	बालोदा		86	0.05				47	0.14
			63	0.31				65/3	0.04
			54	0.16				67/1	0.06
			55	0.11				66	0.37
			56	0.07				74	0.27
			50	0.09				77	0.24
			57	0.15				76	0.23
			48	0.03				75	0.14
			47	0.28				144	0.03
			46/1	0.12				143	0.24
			44	0.25				139	0.11
			42	0.02				145	0.10
			43	0.21				147	0.40
			34	0.24				148	0.16
			151	0.20				174	0.03
			152	0.07				325	0.33
			23	0.04				326	0.10
			153	0.07				327	0.24
			22/2	0.19				330	0.18
			156	0.05				330/341	0.20
			योग	2.71				321	1.11
	राजोदा		1/6	0.06				320	0.02
			26	0.35				334	0.06
			22	0.01				योग	5.66
			25	0.08	इन्दौर	सांवेर	माषलाखेड़ी	81	0.06
			24	0.35				74	0.42
			39	0.03				73	0.27
			43	0.19				72	0.17
			42	1.18				65	0.03
			79	0.07				61/3	0.04
	बिरहमन खेड़ी		योग	2.32				61/2	0.21
			38/3	0.05				58	0.01
			37/1	0.27				59	0.16
			42/1	0.34				55	0.60
			46	0.09				53	0.02

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	मावलखाखेड़ी	99	0.23	इन्दौर	सांवेर	पालिया	468	0.53
			100	0.19			हैदर	470/689	0.06
			98	0.02				507 (जलधारा)	0.02
			101	0.02				456/691	0.02
			102/3	0.07				456	0.03
			103	0.03				455	0.12
			104	0.07				458	0.18
			107/1	0.30				459	0.04
			107/2	0.02				460	0.04
			108/8	0.03				450	0.12
			109	0.01				461	0.04
			115	0.02				449	0.02
			116/1	0.41				448	0.14
			116/3	0.22				685	0.03
			116/2	0.02				योग	3.18
			127	0.02					
			160	0.02			पवारडा	334	0.03
			163/1	0.32			जुनारदा	315	0.52
			165/2	0.42				314	0.05
			166	0.03				236	0.23
		योग	4.46					238	0.36
								237	0.01
		सतलाना	103	0.03				232	0.05
			100	0.31				223	0.02
			99	0.39				222	0.13
			98/175	0.02				195	0.12
			98	0.02				217/1	0.01
			108	0.43				217/2	0.30
			158	0.04				216	0.15
			153	0.29				215	0.07
			152	0.06				204	0.02
			149	0.28				214	0.07
			148	0.55				213	0.10
			137	0.36				210	0.09
			140	0.20				209	0.10
			139	0.05				261	0.10
		योग	3.03					271	0.27
								269	0.01
		पालिया	537	0.06				272	0.02
		हैदर	557	0.25				287	0.10
			556	0.04				276	0.12
			550	0.18				277	0.17
			579	0.16				278	0.06
			580	0.23				279	0.12
			547	0.02				283	0.02
			497	0.19				91	0.02
			496	0.23				85	0.08
			491	0.01				83	0.47
			495	0.16				79	0.03
			492	0.20				73	0.02
			484	0.06					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	पवारडा	71	0.34	इन्दौर	सांवेर	मकोडिया	12	0.29
		जुनारदा	72	0.11				20	0.04
			70	0.29				19	0.37
			69	0.10				78/1	0.18
			63	0.08				78/2	0.28
			316	0.17				79/1	0.01
			317	0.08				88	0.17
			318	0.24				79/2	0.04
			321	0.14				79/3	0.16
			363	0.02				85	0.29
			362	0.15				84	0.37
			361	0.10				128	0.08
			360	0.12				129	0.11
			359	0.03				130/1	0.08
			340	0.02				223/2	0.09
			368	0.14				223/3	0.13
			369	0.01				223/4	0.12
			345	0.33				224	0.42
			374	0.13				225	0.09
			344	0.03				271	0.14
			376	0.56				226	0.02
			384	0.18				266	0.19
			389	0.29				277/1	0.12
			383	0.01				277/4	0.12
			391	0.19				277/3	0.12
			391/401	0.03				286	0.30
			392	0.03				289	0.02
			योग	7.96				286/598	0.04
		जांबुदी	1	0.06				548	0.11
			72/1	0.22				552	0.23
			73	0.36				551	0.36
			74	0.16				588	0.08
			82	0.22				योग	6.61
			76	0.03			मच्छूखेड़ी	21/3	0.06
			77/1	0.14				2/1ए	0.14
			79	0.30				2/2ए	0.14
			362	0.03				2/2बी	0.01
			359	0.88				2/3	0.16
			358	0.24				5/258	0.30
			349	0.16				4	0.06
			368	0.52				10	0.21
			348	0.29				9/1	0.01
			347	0.12				70	0.16
			346	0.10				65	0.02
			योग	3.63				66	0.02
		मकोडिया	2	0.08				69	0.14
			3	0.50				67	0.05
			7	0.59				68	0.22
			11	0.27				82	0.03

1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	मच्छूखेड़ी	95/263	0.06
			95/2	0.26
			95/1	0.34
			100/2	0.01
			101/2/1	0.11
			100/1	0.11
			101/2/2/1	0.03
			101/2/2	0.09
			101/266/3	0.06
			101/266/2	0.16
			101/268/4/2	0.09
			101/266/2/1	0.02
			135	0.11
			137	0.15
			138/2	0.14
			139/2	0.08
			139/1	0.09
			133/1	0.01
			138/1	0.05
			140/1	0.05
			140/2	0.07
			140/3	0.07
			140/4	0.07
			140/5	0.07
			141/2	0.12
			142/1/1	0.01
			146	0.02
			143/1	0.03
			146/3	0.15
			146	0.03
			244/3	0.12
			244/2/3	0.03
			248/2	0.05
			247	0.06
			246	0.09
			245/268	0.20
			248/1/1	0.01
			205	0.04
			योग	4.99
	बरदरी		3	0.05
			46	0.11
			48	0.21
			52	0.26
			62	0.04
			61	0.15
			60	0.41
			59	0.01
			83	0.16
			87	0.04
			योग	1.44

1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	सांवेर	भकरासा	84	0.08
			83	0.14
			100	0.06
			101	0.30
			102	0.02
			103	0.25
			105	0.03
			104	0.08
			योग	0.96

[फा. सं. एल-14014/1/05-जी. पी.-भाग-I]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2005

S.O. 3560.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 768 (E) dated 13-05-2005 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transport of R-LNG through Jagoti to Pithampur and its spur pipelines in the State of Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 03-07-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

And Whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the Right of User in the land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on this date of the publication of the declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Sanwer	Kudana	1040	0.06	Indore	Sanwer	Kudana	772	0.03
		(Manohar-	37	0.05			(Manohar-	993	0.06
		kheri)	633	0.01			kheri)	995	0.02
			634	0.05				994	0.33
			635	0.05				997	0.12
			636	0.01				770	0.06
			630	0.03				TOTAL	6.80
			647	0.01	Indore	Sanwer	Ugamkher	1	0.12
			643	0.11				2	0.01
			639	0.03				4	0.17
			642	0.01				5	0.10
			641	0.05				13/1	0.09
			640	0.01				13/2	0.13
			660	0.05				13/3	0.22
			658	0.09				15/4	0.30
			657	0.04				15/5	0.01
			694	0.07				15/3	0.08
			707	0.09				17	0.13
			706	0.04				14	0.11
			704	0.04				18	0.46
			703	0.01				72	0.04
			705	0.01				25	0.05
			701	0.06				24	0.18
			699	0.02				26	0.37
			698	0.13				49	0.13
			697	0.12				53	0.23
			696	0.01				54	0.09
			695	0.27				55	0.08
			852	0.35				63	0.14
			860	0.06				64	0.01
			850	0.09				67	0.18
			846	0.38				69	0.15
			845	0.01				197	0.07
			837/1	0.04				201	0.16
			838	0.18				202	0.18
			839	0.01				6	0.01
			835	0.18				TOTAL	4.00
			834	0.08	Indore	Sanwer	Sanwer	880	0.08
			831	0.20				861	0.01
			830	0.19				866/1	0.45
			820	0.11				866/2	0.04
			821	0.30				887	0.03
			790	0.16				868	0.26
			787	0.08				856	0.04
			788	0.15				870	0.05
			786	0.07				TOTAL	0.96
			785	0.08	Indore	Sanwer	Lakhman	173/219	0.06
			784	0.15			Kheri	174	0.02
			992	0.06				173	0.03
			774	0.11				175	0.03

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Sanwer	Lakhman Kheri	176 184 183 185 197 195 196 193 204 209 192/1 210 207 212 169 156/1 159 161 158 156/3 156/4 157 150 149 144 143 142 216	0.32 0.14 0.27 0.01 0.01 0.10 0.30 0.11 0.02 0.05 0.01 0.16 0.21 0.03 0.01 0.01 0.06 0.26 0.15 0.01 0.01 0.34 0.21 0.52 0.02 0.21 0.32 0.05	Indore	Sanwer	Devli	112/1 111 109 110 103 102 125	0.10 0.16 0.33 0.01 0.48 0.02 0.04
			TOTAL	4.06				TOTAL	4.36
			164 161 159 158 162 11 12 30 31 32 33 34 80 79 81 86 85 84/2 84/1 87 112/2	0.06 0.71 0.02 0.13 0.11 0.01 0.21 0.39 0.02 0.01 0.23 0.05 0.32 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.16 0.37 0.03 0.27 0.08	Indore	Sanwer	Baloda	86 63 54 55 56 50 57 48 47 46/1 44 42 43 34 151 152 23 153 22/2 156	0.05 0.31 0.16 0.11 0.07 0.09 0.15 0.03 0.28 0.12 0.25 0.02 0.21 0.24 0.20 0.07 0.04 0.07 0.19 0.05
Indore	Sanwer	Devli	TOTAL	2.71				TOTAL	2.71
			164 161 159 158 162 11 12 30 31 32 33 34 80 79 81 86 85 84/2 84/1 87 112/2	0.06 0.71 0.02 0.13 0.11 0.01 0.21 0.39 0.02 0.01 0.23 0.05 0.32 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.16 0.37 0.03 0.27 0.08	Indore	Sanwer	Rajoda	1/6 26 22 25 24 39 43 42 79	0.06 0.35 0.01 0.08 0.35 0.03 0.19 1.18 0.07
			TOTAL	2.32				TOTAL	2.32
			38/3 37/1 42/1 46 42/2 47 83 82 81 77/1 76	0.05 0.27 0.34 0.09 0.02 0.02 0.14 0.15 0.52 0.11 0.02	Indore	Sanwer	Birahman Kheri		

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Sanwer	Birahman	75	0.05	Indore	Sanwer	Mavla	107/2	0.02
		Kheri	TOTAL	1.78			Kheri	108/8	0.03
Indore	Sariwer	Katkya	44/5	0.06				109	0.01
			45	0.14				115	0.02
			51	0.24				116/1	0.41
			46	0.26				116/3	0.22
			48	0.16				116/2	0.02
			47	0.14				127	0.02
			65/3	0.04				160	0.02
			67/1	0.06				163/1	0.32
			66	0.37				165/2	0.42
			74	0.27				166	0.03
			77	0.24				TOTAL	4.46
			76	0.23	Indore	Sanwer	Satlana	103	0.03
			75	0.14				100	0.31
			144	0.03				99	0.39
			143	0.24				98/175	0.02
			139	0.11				98	0.02
			145	0.10				108	0.43
			147	0.40				158	0.04
			148	0.16				153	0.29
			174	0.03				152	0.06
			325	0.33				149	0.28
			326	0.10				148	0.55
			327	0.24				137	0.36
			330	0.18				140	0.20
			330/341	0.20				139	0.05
			321	1.11				TOTAL	3.03
			320	0.02	Indore	Sanwer	Paliya	537	0.06
			334	0.06			Haider	557	0.25
			TOTAL	5.66				556	0.04
Indore	Sanwer	Mavla	81	0.06				550	0.18
		Kheri	74	0.42				579	0.16
			73	0.27				580	0.23
			72	0.17				547	0.02
			65	0.03				497	0.19
			61/3	0.04				496	0.23
			61/2	0.21				491	0.01
			58	0.01				495	0.16
			59	0.16				492	0.20
			55	0.60				484	0.06
			53	0.02				468	0.53
			99	0.23				470/689	0.06
			100	0.19				507 (Stream)	0.02
			98	0.02				456/691	0.02
			101	0.02				456	0.03
			102/3	0.07				455	0.12
			103	0.03				458	0.18
			104	0.07				459	0.04
			107/1	0.30				460	0.04

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Sanwer	Paliya	450	0.12	Indore	Sanwer	Pawarda	362	0.15
		Haider	461	0.04			Junarda	361	0.10
			449	0.02				360	0.12
			448	0.14				359	0.03
			685	0.03				340	0.02
		TOTAL		3.18				368	0.14
Indore	Sanwer	Pawarda	334	0.03				369	0.01
		Junarda	315	0.52				345	0.33
			314	0.05				374	0.13
			236	0.23				344	0.03
			238	0.36				376	0.56
			237	0.01				384	0.18
			232	0.05				389	0.29
			223	0.02				383	0.01
			222	0.13				391	0.19
			195	0.12				391/401	0.03
			217/1	0.01				392	0.03
			217/2	0.30				TOTAL	7.96
			216	0.15	Indore	Sanwer	Jambodi	1	0.06
			215	0.07				72/1	0.22
			204	0.02				73	0.36
			214	0.07				74	0.16
			213	0.10				82	0.22
			210	0.09				76	0.03
			209	0.10				77/1	0.14
			261	0.10				79	0.30
			271	0.27				362	0.03
			269	0.01				359	0.88
			272	0.02				358	0.24
			287	0.10				349	0.16
			276	0.12				368	0.32
			277	0.17				348	0.29
			278	0.06				347	0.12
			279	0.12				346	0.10
			283	0.02				TOTAL	3.63
			91	0.02	Indore	Sanwer	Makodiya	2	0.08
			85	0.08				3	0.50
			83	0.47				7	0.59
			79	0.03				11	0.27
			73	0.02				12	0.29
			71	0.34				20	0.04
			72	0.11				19	0.37
			70	0.29				78/1	0.18
			69	0.10				78/2	0.28
			63	0.08				79/1	0.01
			316	0.17				88	0.17
			317	0.08				79/2	0.04
			318	0.24				79/3	0.16
			321	0.14				85	0.29
			363	0.02				84	0.37

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Sanwer	Makodiya	128	0.08	Indore	Sanwer	Machchhu-	135	0.11
			129	0.11			Kheri	137	0.15
			130/1	0.08				138/2	0.14
			223/2	0.09				139/2	0.08
			223/3	0.13				139/1	0.09
			223/4	0.12				133/1	0.01
			224	0.42				138/1	0.05
			225	0.09				140/1	0.05
			271	0.14				140/2	0.07
			226	0.02				140/3	0.07
			266	0.19				140/4	0.07
			277/1	0.12				140/5	0.07
			277/4	0.12				141/2	0.12
			277/3	0.12				142/1/1	0.01
			286	0.30				146	0.02
			289	0.02				143/1	0.03
			286/598	0.04				146/3	0.15
			548	0.11				146	0.03
			552	0.23				244/3	0.12
			551	0.36				244/2/3	0.03
			588	0.08				248/2	0.05
			TOTAL	6.61				247	0.06
Indore	Sanwer	Machchhu-	21/3	0.06				246	0.09
		kheri	2/1A	0.14				245/268	0.20
			2/2A	0.14				248/1/1	0.01
			2/2B	0.01				205	0.04
			2/3	0.16				TOTAL	4.99
			5/258	0.30	Indore	Sanwer	Baradri	3	0.05
			4	0.06				46	0.11
			10	0.21				48	0.21
			9/1	0.01				52	0.26
			70	0.16				62	0.04
			65	0.02				61	0.15
			66	0.02				60	0.41
			69	0.14				59	0.01
			67	0.05				83	0.16
			68	0.22				87	0.04
			82	0.03				TOTAL	1.44
			95/263	0.06	Indore	Sanwer	Bhavarsa	84	0.08
			95/2	0.26				83	0.14
			95/1	0.34				100	0.06
			100/2	0.01				101	0.30
			101/2/1	0.11				102	0.02
			100/1	0.11				103	0.25
			101/2/2/1	0.03				105	0.03
			101/2/2	0.09				104	0.08
			101/266/3	0.06				TOTAL	0.96
			101/266/2	0.16					
			101/268/4/2	0.09					
			101/266/2/1	0.02					

[F.No. L-14014/1/05/G.P.-(Part-I)]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितंबर, 2005					1	2	3	4	5
का.आ. 3561.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 784(अ) तारीख 30-5-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से आर.एल.एन.जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;					इन्दौर	इन्दौर	लिम्बोदा	1/3/1/2	0.15
								4	0.46
और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 7-7-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;								35/1/1	0.16
								35/2	0.44
और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;								35/3	0.12
								36	0.03
और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;								41/2/2	0.44
								42	0.86
और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित हैं, उस में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;								42/1/2	0.01
								43	0.30
अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;								44/1	0.29
								44/2	0.45
और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के अकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, पाइपलाइनों बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।								45	0.04
								39/2/2	0.04
अनुसूची								376	0.06
								374/4	0.03
जिला तहसील गाँव सर्वे नं. आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)								375	0.16
								377/2/1	0.01
1								370	0.09
								369	0.20
2								384	0.13
								385	0.09
3								383/1/1	0.01
								382/1/2	0.13
4								382/1/1	0.09
								382/2	0.05
5								389	0.11
								390	0.05
योग								392/1/1	0.11
								392/2	0.11
पालाखेड़ी								395	0.02
								396	0.09
बुढ़ानिया								391	0.11
								योग	5.96
1								29/1	0.07
								2	0.37
2								9	0.14
								1	0.17
3								योग	0.75
								323	0.16
4								320/2/1/4	0.01
								322/2	0.23
5								320/2/1/5	0.01
								324/2/1	0.18
योग								324/2/2	0.25

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	इन्दौर	बुढ़ानिया	324/1/2	0.01	इन्दौर	इन्दौर	जम्बुर- डीहपसी	106	0.17
			324/1/1/1	0.20				170	0.31
			324/1/1/2	0.26				168	0.08
			329	0.05				171	0.25
			328	0.28				167	0.38
			330/1	0.26				166	0.20
			330/2	0.27				172	0.01
			336	0.25				163	0.46
			337/2	0.22				544	0.02
			305	0.24				546	0.01
			354/2/2	0.06				545	0.02
			354/1/1	0.20				547	0.27
			354/2/1	0.26				543	0.20
			351	0.12				557	0.28
			353	0.12				558	0.02
			352/1	0.12				566/2	0.02
			352/2	0.17				566/1	0.18
			350	0.31				565	0.19
			346	0.17				563	0.44
			52	0.01				582	0.06
			362	0.01				583/1/1	0.15
			364	0.05				591	0.60
			363	0.16				413	0.02
			384	0.05				594	0.39
			385/1	0.10				595	0.39
			385/2	0.09				399	0.04
			386	0.05				योग	6.27
			387	0.17			रिजलाय	1	0.11
			388	0.05				32	0.62
			390	0.03				31/1	0.28
			393/1/1/1	0.11				31/2	0.28
			394	0.14				32/318	0.13
			175	0.50				24	0.19
			172/1	0.39				23	0.09
			171	0.08				21	0.23
			162/3/1	0.15				70	0.02
			162/3/2	0.22				100	0.17
			170/2	0.03				109	0.43
			169/2/2	0.27				102/1/1	0.24
			169/2/1	0.08				104	0.06
			योग	7.15				103	0.07
		जम्बुर-	120	0.01				105	0.19
		डीहपसी	138	0.58				106	0.14
			140	0.01				115	0.05
			139	0.50				200	0.08
			134	0.01				199	0.08

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	इन्दौर	रिजलाय	201	0.10	इन्दौर	इन्दौर	कलारिया	103	0.05
			सर्वे सं.					121	0.13
			201 व					106	0.21
			210					120	0.43
			के बीच में	0.01				124	0.20
			210	0.02				117	0.28
			212	0.08				116	0.24
			216	0.22				115	0.07
			215	0.20				110	0.03
			217	0.38				114	0.68
			218	0.21				173	0.02
			220/2	0.36				172	0.18
			220/1	0.31				176	0.17
			226/1/2	0.31				177	0.04
			226/2	0.07				239	0.03
			226/3	0.21				341	0.05
			219	0.09				358	0.41
			233	0.01				352	0.07
			योग	6.04				354	0.11
		बिसनावदा	1	0.01				353	0.04
			योग	0.01				योग	3.44
		सावलिगा-	115	0.06	इन्दौर	देपालपुर	धरावर-	818	0.05
		खेड़ी	132	0.24			जागीर	819	0.03
			153	0.38				816/2	0.30
			155	0.28				815	0.20
			157	0.10				811/1	0.24
			158	0.13				811/2	0.16
			159	0.22				811/3/2	0.15
			161	0.01				811/5	0.11
			योग	1.42				129	0.27
		घरनवदा	174	0.01				130/3	0.01
			173/2	0.36				810	0.06
			172/1/3	0.46				804/2	0.17
			178/2	0.15				804/4	0.06
			179	0.04				804/1/2	0.08
			187/1	0.35				806/2	0.03
			190/2	0.20				806/3	0.12
			193/6	0.10				145	0.01
			198	0.27				773	0.09
			196	0.01				770	0.01
			197	0.55				769	0.11
			221	0.58				768	0.03
			228	0.05				766	0.10
			229	0.05				765	0.04
			योग	3.18					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	देपालपुर	धरावरा- जागीर	764	0.08	इन्दौर	देपालपुर	धरावरा	498/2	0.10
			756	0.05			जागीर — (जारी)	494/1	0.07
			163	0.05				493	0.20
			755	0.07				474	0.06
			164	0.02				योग	7.20
			754/2	0.01			धनद	124	0.08
			754/1	0.03				121	0.10
			169	0.05				120	0.21
			170	0.06				118	0.06
			174	0.11				119/2	0.01
			175	0.01				115	0.38
			173	0.06				105	0.16
			176	0.05				104	0.01
			177	0.06				103	0.01
			179	0.10				102	0.03
			180	0.02				101	0.01
			182	0.23				100	0.06
			183	0.07				97/2	0.05
			184	0.06				98/1	0.02
			185	0.02				99	0.04
			203	0.17				25	0.25
			607	0.17				90	0.09
			605	0.06				89	0.03
			604/2	0.14				84	0.18
			604/1	0.15				559	0.02
			615/1	0.11				560	0.06
			615/3	0.08				561	0.09
			615/2	0.11				563	0.08
			616	0.03				564	0.05
			617	0.25				580	0.05
			618/2	0.04				579	0.05
			620	0.19				577	0.03
			603	0.07				578	0.02
			508/1	0.01				576	0.05
			508/2	0.03				575	0.04
			507/2	0.02				574	0.06
			507/1	0.09				592	0.03
			507/3	0.08				600	0.06
			507/4	0.08				601	0.05
			507/5	0.07				602	0.13
			507/6	0.07				603	0.03
			506/1	0.18				606	0.01
			506/3	0.19				605	0.02
			505/1	0.17				607	0.03
			504/1	0.14				608	0.08
			503	0.03				610	0.09
			502	0.14				613	0.10
			499	0.17				619	0.05
			498/1	0.09				योग	3.06

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	देपालपुर	मेठवाड़ा	436	0.07	इन्दौर	देपालपुर	ओसरोद	56	0.25
			435	0.12			— (जारी)	49/1	0.06
			403	0.37				48	0.24
			402	0.47				44	0.18
			398	0.04				22	0.17
			योग	1.07				24	0.14
		सांगवी	225/3	0.03				21	0.01
			223	0.02				25	0.19
			207	0.41				27/1	0.04
			224	0.07				18	0.01
			206	0.01				9	0.24
			208	0.12				10	0.13
			204	0.01				12/2	0.08
			209	0.06				12/1	0.10
			164	0.03				2	0.09
			196	0.11				76	0.09
			195	0.27				योग	2.33
			167	0.14					
			170	0.09					
			171	0.23					
			28	0.11					
			24	0.20					
			26	0.31					
			14	0.08					
			43	0.02					
			5/1	0.06					
			6	0.27					
			7	0.17					
			2/1	0.28					
			1/2	0.04					
			3	0.03					
			योग	3.17					
		घटाबिल्लोद	300	0.03					
			283	0.06					
			282	0.20					
			280	0.01					
			275	0.02					
			274	0.19					
			258	0.02					
			योग	0.53					
		ओसरोद	229	0.03					
			36	0.02					
			75	0.06					
			74	0.03					
			77	0.17					

[फा. सं. एल-14014/1/05-जी.पी. (भाग-1)]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2005

S.O. 3561.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 784(E) dated 30-05-2005 Issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transport of R-LNG through Jagoti to Pithampur and its spur pipeline in the State of Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 07-07-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the Right of User in the land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on this date of the publication of the declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Distt.	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be Acquired for R.O.U. (in Hectares)
1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Indore	Limboda Gari	17	0.09
			1/3/2/2	0.05
			1/3/2/1	0.42
			1/3/1/2	0.15
			4	0.46
			35/1/1	0.16
			35/2	0.44
			35/3	0.12
			36	0.03
			41/2/2	0.44
			42	0.86
			42/1/2	0.01
			43	0.30
			44/1	0.29
			44/2	0.45
			45	0.04
			39/2/2	0.04
			376	0.06
			374/4	0.03
			375	0.16
			377/2/1	0.01
			370	0.09
			369	0.20
			384	0.13
			385	0.09
			383/1/1	0.01
			382/1/2	0.13
			382/1/1	0.09
			382/2	0.05
			389	0.11
			390	0.05
			392/1/1	0.11
			392/2	0.11
			395	0.02
			396	0.09
			391	0.11
			Total	5.96

1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Indore	Palakheri	29/1	0.07
			2	0.37
			9	0.14
			1	0.17
			Total	0.75
		Bud-haniya	323	0.16
			320/2/1/4	0.01
			322/2	0.23
			320/2/1/5	0.01
			324/2/1	0.18
			324/2/2	0.25
			324/1/2	0.01
			324/1/1/1	0.20
			324/1/1/2	0.26
			329	0.05
			328	0.28
			330/1	0.26
			330/2	0.27
			336	0.25
			337/2	0.22
			305	0.24
			354/2/2	0.06
			354/1/1	0.20
			354/2/1	0.26
			351	0.12
			353	0.12
			352/1	0.12
			352/2	0.17
			350	0.31
			346	0.17
			52	0.01
			362	0.01
			364	0.05
			363	0.16
			384	0.05
			385/1	0.10
			385/2	0.09
			386	0.05
			387	0.17
			388	0.05
			390	0.03
			393/1/1/1	0.11
			394	0.14
			175	0.50
			172/1	0.39
			171	0.08
			162/3/1	0.15
			162/3/2	0.22
			170/2	0.03

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Indore	Budhaniya	169/2/2	0.27	Indore	Indore	Rinjlay	106	0.14
		—(contd.)	169/2/1	0.08			—(Contd.)	115	0.05
			Total	7.15				200	0.08
		Jamburdi Hapsi	120	0.01				199	0.08
			138	0.58				201	0.10
			140	0.01				In Bet Svy No.	
			139	0.50				201 & 210	0.01
			134	0.01				210	0.02
			106	0.17				212	0.08
			170	0.31				216	0.22
			168	0.08				215	0.20
			171	0.25				217	0.38
			167	0.38				218	0.21
			166	0.20				220/2	0.36
			172	0.01				220/1	0.31
			163	0.46				226/1/2	0.31
			544	0.02				226/2	0.07
			546	0.01				226/3	0.21
			545	0.02				219	0.09
			547	0.27				233	0.01
			543	0.20				Total	6.04
			557	0.28			Bishna-	1	0.01
			558	0.02			vada		
			566/2	0.02				Total	0.01
			566/1	0.18			Savliya-	115	0.06
			565	0.19			Kheri	132	0.24
			563	0.44				153	0.38
			582	0.06				155	0.28
			583/1/1	0.15				157	0.10
			591	0.60				158	0.13
			413	0.02				159	0.22
			594	0.39				161	0.01
			595	0.39				Total	1.42
			399	0.04			Dharna-	174	0.01
			Total	6.27			vada	173/2	0.36
		Rinjlay	1	0.11				172/1/3	0.46
			32	0.62				178/2	0.15
			31/1	0.28				179	0.04
			31/2	0.28				187/1	0.35
			32/3 18	0.13				190/2	0.20
			24	0.19				193/6	0.10
			23	0.09				198	0.27
			21	0.23				196	0.01
			70	0.02				197	0.55
			100	0.17				221	0.58
			109	0.43				228	0.05
			102/1/1	0.24				229	0.05
			104	0.06				Total	3.18
			103	0.07			Kalariya	103	0.05
			105	0.19				121	0.13

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Indore	Kalariya (Contd.)	106 120 124 117 116 115 110 114 173 172 176 177 239 341 358 352 354 353	0.21 0.43 0.20 0.28 0.24 0.07 0.03 0.68 0.02 0.18 0.17 0.04 0.03 0.05 0.41 0.07 0.11 0.04	Indore	Depalpur	Dharawara Jagir (Contd.)	170 174 175 173 176 177 179 180 182 183 184 185 203 607 605 604/2 604/1 615/1 615/3 615/2 616 617 618/2 620 603 508/1 508/2 507/2 507/1 507/3 507/4 507/5 507/6 506/1 506/3 505/1 504/1 503 502 499 498/1 498/2 494/1 493 474	0.06 0.11 0.01 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.10 0.02 0.23 0.07 0.06 0.02 0.17 0.17 0.06 0.14 0.15 0.11 0.08 0.11 0.03 0.25 0.04 0.19 0.07 0.01 0.03 0.02 0.09 0.08 0.08 0.07 0.07 0.18 0.19 0.17 0.14 0.03 0.14 0.17 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.20 0.06
			Total	3.44					
	Depalpur	Dhara- vara Jagir	818 819 816/2 815 811/1 811/2 811/3/2 811/5 129 130/3 810 804/2 804/4 804/1/2 806/2 806/3 145 773 770 769 768 766 765 764 756 163 755 164 754/2 754/1 169	0.05 0.03 0.30 0.20 0.24 0.16 0.15 0.11 0.27 0.01 0.06 0.17 0.06 0.08 0.03 0.12 0.01 0.09 0.01 0.11 0.03 0.10 0.04 0.08 0.05 0.05 0.07 0.02 0.01 0.03 0.05	Indore	Depalpur	Dhannad	124 121 120 118	0.08 0.10 0.21 0.06
								Total	7.20

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Depalpur	Dhannad	119/2	0.01	Indore	Depalpur	Sangavi	204	0.01
		—(Contd.)	115	0.38			(Contd.)	209	0.06
			105	0.16				164	0.03
			104	0.01				196	0.11
			103	0.01				195	0.27
			102	0.03				167	0.14
			101	0.01				170	0.09
			100	0.06				171	0.23
			97/2	0.05				28	0.11
			98/1	0.02				24	0.20
			99	0.04				26	0.31
			25	0.25				14	0.08
			90	0.09				43	0.02
			89	0.03				5/1	0.06
			84	0.18				6	0.27
			559	0.02				7	0.17
			560	0.06				2/1	0.28
			561	0.09				1/2	0.04
			563	0.08				3	0.03
			564	0.05				Total	3.17
			580	0.05		Depalpur	Ghata-	300	0.03
			579	0.05			billod	283	0.06
			577	0.03				282	0.20
			578	0.02				280	0.01
			576	0.05				275	0.02
			575	0.04				274	0.19
			574	0.06				258	0.02
			592	0.03				Total	0.53
			600	0.06	Indore	Depalpur	Osarod	229	0.03
			601	0.05				36	0.02
			602	0.13				75	0.06
			603	0.03				74	0.03
			606	0.01				77	0.17
			605	0.02				56	0.25
			607	0.03				49/1	0.06
			608	0.08				48	0.24
			610	0.09				44	0.18
			613	0.10				22	0.17
			619	0.05				24	0.14
			Total	3.06				21	0.01
	Depalpur	Metha-	436	0.07				25	0.19
		wada	435	0.12				27/1	0.04
			403	0.37				18	0.01
			402	0.47				9	0.24
			398	0.04				10	0.13
	Depalpur	Sangavi	Total	1.07				12/2	0.08
			225/3	0.3				12/1	0.10
			223	0.02				2	0.09
			207	0.41				76	0.09
			224	0.07				Total	2.33
			206	0.01					
			208	0.12					

[File No.-L-14014/1/05 G.P. (Part-I)]

S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3562.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 785(अ) तारीख 30-05-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से आर.-एल.एन.जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 12-07-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और इन्हें अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित हैं, उस में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, पाइपलाइनें बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गाँव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्र- फल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
धार	धार	सुलावड	276	0.10
			275	0.10

1	2	3	4	5
धार	धार	सुलावड	271/1	.22
			268	0.21
			266	0.02
			260/2	0.07
			261/1	0.21
			262/3	0.03
			110/4	0.01
			263/4	0.15
			263/3	0.04
			110/3	0.10
			110/2	0.09
			109/1	0.16
			107/1	0.18
			24	0.14
			108	0.06
			278	0.02
			277	0.02
			योग	1.93
धार	धार	सेजवाया	424	0.03
			423	0.39
			422	0.11
			420	0.01
			419	0.18
			418	0.11
			417	0.07
			416/4	0.03
			409/435	0.03
			316/2	0.05
			315	0.03
			314	0.01
			311	0.22
			300	0.36
			297	0.06
			288	0.18
			289	0.08
			283/1	0.35
			282	0.07
			268	0.09
			263/1	0.08
			262/2/3	0.42
			261/2	0.01
			261/1	0.25

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
धार	धार	सेजवाया	256	0.03	Dhar	Dhar	Sulawad	268	0.21
			255	0.01				266	0.02
			254	0.02				260/2	0.07
			योग	3.28				261/1	0.21
[फा. सं. एल-14014/1/05-जी.पी. (भाग-II)]								262/3	0.03
एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव								110/4	0.01
New Delhi, the 28th September, 2005								263/4	0.15
S.O. 3562.—Whereas by notification of the								263/3	0.04
Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and								110/3	0.10
Natural Gas number S.O. 785(E) dated 30-05-2005 issued								110/2	0.09
under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and								109/1	0.16
Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of Users in								107/1	0.18
Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as								24	0.14
the said Act), the Central Government declared its								108	0.06
intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified								278	0.02
in the Schedule appended to that notification for the								277	0.02
purpose of laying pipeline for transport of R-LNG through									
Jagoti to Pithampur and its spur pipelines in the State of									
Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;									
And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification									
were made available to the public on the 12-07-2005.									
And whereas the objections received from the public									
to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and									
disallowed by the Competent Authority;									
And whereas the Competent Authority has, under									
sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its									
report to the Central Government;									
And whereas the Central Government has, after									
considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of									
User in the lands specified in the Schedule;									
Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred									
by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central									
Government hereby declares the Right of User in the land									
specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the									
pipeline;									
And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by									
sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central									
Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the									
said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in									
the Central Government, vest, on this date of the									
publication of this declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited,									
free from all encumbrances.									
- SCHEDULE									
District	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for ROU (in Hect.)					
1	2	3	4	5					
Dhar	Dhar	Sulawad	276	0.10					
			275	0.10					
			271/1	0.22					

1	2	3	4	5
Dhar	Dhar	Sejwaya	255	0.01
			254	0.02
		TOTAL		3.28

[File No. L-14014/1/05-G.P. (Pt-II)]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3563.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य में दहेज-हजीरा-उरान एवं स्मर पाइपलाइनों द्वारा प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा, एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में, श्री विजय जोशी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, गेल आशियाना भवन, सेक्टर 8बी, 3 डी2, सी.बी.डी., बेलापुर, नवी मुम्बई-400 614 (महाराष्ट्र) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गाँव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्र० (हेक्टेयर में)
------	-------	------	-----------	--

1	2	3	4	5
रायगढ़	पेण	खारगांधे	33	00-31-00
		गांवठाण		00-03-00
			30/13पै	00-08-00
			30/12पै	00-04-00
			31/5पै	00-10-00
			31/4पै	00-11-00
			31/2Aपै	00-13-00
			31/2Bपै	00-05-00
			31/1पै	00-04-00

1	2	3	4	5
रायगढ़	पेण	खारगांधे	24/6पै	00-13-00
			24/5पै	00-31-00
			24/3पै	00-03-00
			24/1पै	00-14-00
			25/2पै	00-02-00
			7/2पै	00-12-00
			7/1Aपै	00-00-50
			15/5पै	00-13-00
			15/4पै	00-30-00
			15/3Aपै	00-03-00
			15/3Bपै	00-02-00
			15/2Aपै	00-01-00
			22/4पै	00-16-00
			22/3पै	00-14-00
			22/1पै	00-16-00
			16/4पै	00-09-00
			16/3पै	00-07-00
			16/1Bपै	00-10-00
			17/4Aपै	00-14-00
			17/4Bपै	00-10-00
			17/2Aपै	00-10-00
			21/2पै	00-02-00
			21/3पै	00-20-00
			18/4पै	00-11-00
			18/3पै	00-02-00
			20/3पै	00-13-00
			20/1पै	00-09-00
			33/Aपै	00-14-00
			19/0	00-10-00
		योग		4-00-50

सुधागढ़ खांडसई

39/2	00-29-00
39/3पै	00-17-00
39/4पै	00-01-00
38/1पै	00-04-00
38/2पै	00-01-00
37/1पै	00-05-00
37/2पै	00-01-00
37/3पै	00-06-00
37/7पै	00-03-00
44/1पै	00-02-00

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
रायगड	सुधागड	खांडसई	44/2A पै	00-15-00	रायगड	खालापूर	कोडगांव	55 पै	00-62-00
			44/2B पै	00-13-00				नाला	00-17-00
			44/3 पै	00-02-00				53 पै	00-09-00
			46/1 पै	00-34-00				41 पै	00-02-00
			46/4 पै	00-00-50				40 पै	00-24-00
			46/5 पै	00-03-00				1 पै	00-79-00
			46/7 पै	00-20-00				नाला	00-13-00
			43/1A पै	00-10-00				2 पै	00-65-00
			43/1B पै	00-28-00				42 पै	00-15-00
			43/3 पै					43 पै	00-01-00
			45/1A पै	00-38-00				44 पै	00-01-00
			45/1B पै					45 पै	00-42-00
			45/1K पै					46 पै	00-01-00
			45/3 पै	00-22-00				47 पै	00-21-00
			योग	02-54-50				बैलगाडी रास्ता	00-01-00
		कोडगांव	92 पै	00-33-00				48 पै	00-20-00
			91 पै	00-36-00				94 पै	00-90-00
			नाला	00-09-00				54 पै	00-01-00
			60 पै	00-24-00				योग	07-56-00
			61 पै	00-36-00					
			64 पै	00-24-00					
			63 पै	00-69-00					
			69 पै	00-27-00					
			65 पै	00-01-00					
			72 पै	00-36-00					
			77 पै	00-45-00					
			नाला	00-12-00					
			78 पै	00-15-00					
			योग	03-67-00					
		खालापूर	कोडगांव	60 पै					
				99 पै					
				95 पै					
				93 पै					
				नाला					
				बैलगाडी रास्ता					
				58 पै					
				63 पै					
				56 पै					

[फा. सं. एल-14014/23/05-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3563.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of natural gas through Dahej-Hazira-Uran and its spur pipelines in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid by the GAIL (India) Limited ;

And, whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri Vijay Joshi, Competent Authority, GAIL (India) Limited, Gail Ashiyana Building, Sector 8B, 3D2, C.B.D., Belapur, Navi Mumbai-400 614 (Maharashtra).

SCHEDULE

District	Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for ROU (in Hect.)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Raigad	Sudhaghad	Khandsai	38/2P	00-01-00
Raigad	Pen	Khargandhe	33	00-31-00				37/1P	00-05-00
		Gavthan		00-03-00				37/2P	00-01-00
		30/13P		00-08-00				37/3P	00-06-00
		30/12P		00-04-00				37/7P	00-03-00
		31/5P		00-10-00				44/1P	00-02-00
		31/4P		00-11-00				44/2AP	00-15-00
		31/2AP		00-13-00				44/2BP	00-13-00
		31/2BP		00-05-00				44/3P	00-02-00
		31/1P		00-04-00				46/1P	00-34-00
		24/6P		00-13-00				46/4P	00-00-50
		24/5P		00-31-00				46/5P	00-03-00
		24/3P		00-03-00				46/7P	00-20-00
		24/1P		00-14-00				43/1AP	00-10-00
		25/2P		00-02-00				43/1BP	00-28-00
		7/2P		00-12-00				43/3P	
		7/1AP		00-00-50				45/1AP	00-38-00
		15/5P		00-13-00				45/1BP	
		15/4P		00-30-00				45/1KP	
		15/3AP		00-03-00				45/3P	00-22-00
		15/3BP		00-02-00				TOTAL	02-54-50
		15/2AP		00-01-00				Kondgaon 92P	00-33-00
		22/4P		00-16-00				91P	00-36-00
		22/3P		00-14-00				NALA	00-09-00
		22/1P		00-16-00				60P	00-24-00
		16/4P		00-09-00				61P	00-36-00
		16/3P		00-07-00				64P	00-24-00
		16/1BP		00-10-00				63P	00-69-00
		17/4AP		00-14-00				69P	00-27-00
		17/4BP		00-10-00				65P	00-01-00
		17/2AP		00-10-00				72P	00-36-00
		21/2P		00-02-00				77P	00-45-00
		21/3P		00-20-00				NALA	00-12-00
		18/4P		00-11-00				78P	00-15-00
		18/3P		00-02-00				TOTAL	03-67-00
		20/3P		00-13-00				Khalapur Kargaon 60P	00-11-00
		20/1P		00-09-00				99P	00-75-00
		33/AP		00-14-00				95P	00-01-00
		19A		00-10-00				93P	00-76-00
		TOTAL		4-00-50				NALA	00-04-00
		Sudhaghad Khandsai 39/2		00-29-00				C.T.	00-01-00
		39/3P		00-17-00				58P	00-27-00
		39/4P		00-01-00				63P	00-77-00
		38/1P		00-04-00				56P	00-20-00
								55P	00-62-00
								NALA	00-17-00

1	2	3	4	5
Raigad	Khalapur Kargaon	53P	00-09-00	
		41P	00-02-00	
		40P	00-24-00	
		1P	00-79-00	
		NALA	00-13-00	
		2P	00-65-00	
		42P	00-15-00	
		43P	00-01-00	
		44P	00-01-00	
		45P	00-42-00	
		46P	00-01-00	
		47P	00-21-00	
		C.T.	00-01-00	
		48P	00-20-00	
		94P	00-90-00	
		54P	00-01-00	
		TOTAL	07-56-00	

[F. No. L-14014/23/05-G.P.]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3544.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 692(अ) तारीख 14-06-2004 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा महाराष्ट्र राज्य में दहेज-हजीरा-उरान एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 04-04-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उस में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा

करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, पाइपलाइनों बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गांव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
रायगड	खालापूर	लोधीवली	87	00-01-00
			54/1+2	00-14-00
			54/3	00-25-00
			57/3	00-01-00
		निबोंडे	62/2	00-01-00
			62/4	00-36-00
		निगडोली	44/2ए	00-29-00
			44/2बी	
		उम्बरे	172/0	00-52-00
		देवन्हावे	20/6	00-01-00
			21/3	00-07-00
			22/1	00-34-00
			22/3	00-01-00
			23/1	00-00-50
			23/2	00-22-00
			32/1 डी+2	00-06-00
			32/1 सी	
			31/1	00-74-00
			33/10	00-01-00
सुधागड	जांभुलपाडा		21/5ए	00-19-00
			21/5 बी	
			22/1	00-26-00
			25/2 ए	00-30-00
			25/2 बी	
			23	00-01-00
		नाडसुर	243	00-53-00

1	2	3	4	5
रायगढ़	सुधागढ़	नाडसुर	246	00-92-00
			23	00-14-00
			25	00-43-00
			64	00-18-00
			118	00-14-00

[फ.सं. एल-14014/23/05-जी.पी.]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3564.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 692(E) dated 14-6-2004 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transport of natural gas through Dahej-Hazira-Uran and its spur pipelines in the State of Maharashtra by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 04-04-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the Right of User in the land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on this date of the publication of the declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Distt.	Tahuka	Village	Survey No.	Area to be Acquired for R.O.U. (in Hectares)
1	2	3	4	5
Raigad	Khalapur	Lodhivali	87	00-01-00
			54/1+2	00-14-00

1	2	3	4	5
Raigad	Khalapur	Lodhivali	54/3	00-25-00
			57/3	00-01-00
		Nimbode	62/2	00-01-00
			62/4	00-36-00
		Nigdoti	44/2A	
			44/2B	00-29-00
		Umbare	172/0	00-52-00
		Devnahave	20/6	00-01-00
			21/3	00-07-00
			22/1	00-34-00
			22/3	00-01-00
			23/1	00-00-50
			23/2	00-22-00
			32/1D+2	
			32/1C	00-06-00
			31/1	00-74-00
			33/10	00-01-00
	Sudhagad	Jambulpada	21/5A	
			21/5B	00-19-00
			22/1	00-26-00
			25/2A	
			25/2B	00-30-00
			23	00-01-00
	Nadsur		243	00-53-00
			246	00-92-00
			23	00-14-00
			25	00-43-00
			64	00-18-00
			118	00-14-00

[F.No. L-14014/23/05-G.P.]

S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3565.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि पॉन्डिचेरी केन्द्र शासित प्रदेश में वैगई इन्डस्ट्रीज पाइपलाइन में टैप ऑफ से एम.सी. लिमिटेड स्पर पाइपलाइन परियोजना द्वारा प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा, एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के

अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाईन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में, श्री वी. रामाचन्द्रन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, 4-बी, सेन्चुरी प्लाजा, 560-562, अन्ना सलाई तेयनापेट, चेन्नई-600018 (तमिलनाडु) को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गाँव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ. यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
कराइकल	थिरुनल्लूर	16. सोराकुडी	226-1	0.01.0 G.P.
			226-2	0.01.0 G.P.
			224	0.02.0 G.P.
			225-1	0.06.5
			225-4	0.01.0 G.P.
			225-5	0.03.0
			योग	0.14.5
		4. देवपुरम्	152-1	0.01.0 G.P.
			152-3C	0.15.0
			172-1	0.01.0 G.P.
			172-2	0.43.0
			173-3	0.12.05.0
			173-4	0.06.0
			173-5	0.06.0
			173-10	0.01.0 G.P.
			200-1	0.14.0
			200-2	0.10.0
			200-3	0.01.0 G.P.
			201-1	0.08.0
			201-2	0.03.0
			201-3	0.09.0
			201-4	0.06.0
			201-5	0.03.5 G.P.
			202-1	0.00.5 G.P.
			202-5	0.02.0 G.P.
			योग	0.42.5

[फा. सं. एल-14014/22/05-जी.पी.]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3565.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of natural gas through Vaigai Industries Pipeline in Tap Off to MC Ltd. spur pipeline project in Union Territory of Pondicherry, a pipeline should be laid by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And, whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is

necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the General public, object in writing to the laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri V. Ramachandran, Competent Authority, GAIL (India) Limited, 4-B, Century Plaza, 560 562, Anna Salai Teynampet, Chennai-600018 (Tamil Nadu).

SCHEDULE

Distt.	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for R.O.U. (in Hectares)
1	2	3	4	5
Karikal	Thirunallar	16. Sorakudy	226-1	0.01.0 G.P.
			226-2	0.01.0 G.P.
			224	0.02.0 G.P.
			225-1	0.06.5
			225-4	0.01.0 G.P.
			225-5	0.03.0
			Total	0.14.5
		4. Devama-puram	152-1	0.01.0 G.P.
			152-3C	0.15.0
			172-1	0.01.0 G.P.
			172-2	0.43.0
			173-3	0.12.05.0
			173-4	0.06.0
			173-5	0.06.0
			173-10	0.01.0 G.P.
			200-1	0.14.0
			200-2	0.10.0
			200-3	0.01.0 G.P.
			201-1	0.08.0
			201-2	0.03.0
			201-3	0.09.0
			201-4	0.06.0
			201-5	0.03.5 G.P.
			202-1	0.00.5 G.P.
			202-5	0.02.0 G.P.
			Total	0.42.5

[F. No. L-14014/22/05-G.P.]

S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3566.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 783 (अ) तारीख 30-05-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से आर.-एल.एन.जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 12-07-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित हैं, उस में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइने बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि पाइपलाइने बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, पाइपलाइने बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गांव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
देवास	देवास	बरोठपिपल्या	9	0.04
			128	0.05
			127	0.34
			146	0.13
			145	0.13

1	2	3	4	5
देवास	देवास	बरोठपिपल्या	143	0.11
			142	0.27
			136	0.16
			134	0.14
			135	0.01
			168	0.03
			312	0.28
			307	0.01
			306	0.01
			333	0.13
			332	0.07
			331	0.05
			337	0.13
			338	0.04
			339	0.06
			298	0.12
			340	0.02
			297	0.41
			344	0.25
			290	0.11
			289	0.17
			281	0.08
			280	0.03
			355	0.17
			357	0.04
			योग	3.59
		हवनखेड़ी	102	0.07
			100	0.13
			96	0.19
			94	0.19
			93	0.09
			92	0.17
			91	0.16
			87	0.33
			82	0.14
			80	0.01
			83	0.28
			77	0.13
			73	0.28
			72	0.25
			21	0.03
			23	0.01
			योग	2.46

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
देवास	देवास	सुतारखेड़ी	69	0.03	देवास	देवास	अमोना	3/2	0.06
			45	0.29				4/1	0.01
			43	0.13				4/2	0.02
			42	0.16				3/3	0.16
			41	0.37				योग	1.19
			55	0.27			चंदाना	660	0.07
			39	0.12				656	0.05
			56	0.05				657	0.60
		योग	1.42					658	0.02
		बिंजाना	1	0.06				650	0.25
			4/3	0.25				649	0.22
			5	0.27				662	0.34
			41	0.15				योग	1.55
			42	0.21			बीराखेड़ी	7/1	0.30
			36	0.34				8	0.02
			42/302	0.15				6	0.03
			46	0.24				5	0.02
			52	0.03				4	0.13
			60/303	0.22				3	0.12
			60/2	0.33				2	0.24
			58	0.22				24	0.04
			59	0.33				23	0.01
			63	0.17				योग	0.91
			64	0.16			मेंडकीचक	206	0.02
			65	0.19				204	0.02
			66	0.03				198	0.02
			54	0.08				203	0.01
			76/307	0.01				202	0.04
			76	0.17				200	0.11
			75	0.33				213/2	0.03
			74	0.27				213/1	0.19
			69/4	0.55				227	0.23
			69/2	0.18				226	0.12
			71	0.31				225	0.14
			69/5	0.11				224	0.01
			69/6	0.10				217	0.11
			69/7	0.06				222	0.08
			69/8	0.08				218	0.05
		योग	5.60					219	0.11
		अमोना	8/1	0.23				175	0.02
			2	0.23				164	0.04
			3/1	0.48				165	0.35

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
देवास	देवास	मेंडकीचक	160	0.01	देवास	देवास	नागूखेडी	167	0.15
			140	0.07				168	0.17
			63/2	0.11				169	0.04
			63/3	0.14				171	0.01
			66	0.43				172	0.24
			68	0.01				163	0.08
			73	0.25				योग	3.87
			75	0.06					
			46	0.01			करनखेडी	269	0.24
			76	0.19				268/1	0.03
			45	0.12				268/2	0.04
			82	0.09				73	0.05
			81	0.01				योग	0.36
			80	0.24					
			84/1	0.10			नोसाराबाद	12	0.03
			84/2	0.11				49	0.10
			86/2	0.26				55	0.26
			87	0.05				54	0.26
			88	0.24				58	0.37
			112	0.03				60	0.44
			95	0.01				65	0.29
			111	0.18				64	0.06
			97	0.26				66	0.03
			99	0.17				138	0.06
			100	0.18				80	0.08
			1/2	0.06				79	0.20
			योग	5.09				75	0.28
								74	0.23
								203	0.08
								योग	2.77
		नागूखेडी	264	0.07					
			253	0.39					
			132/3	0.15			कालूखेडी	1/3	0.01
			252/2	0.01				96	0.12
			133	0.26				95	0.48
			134	0.03				98	0.56
			135	0.35				97	0.47
			239	0.17				योग	1.64
			237	0.47					
			149	0.41					
			151	0.12					
			10	0.07					
			217	0.26					
			212	0.06					
			211	0.21					
			210	0.15					

[फ. सं. एल-14014/1/05-जी.पी. (भाग- II)]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3566.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 783(E) dated 30-05-2005 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land)

Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transport of R-LNG through Jagoti to Pithampur and its spur pipeline in the State of Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on 12-07-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the Right of User in the land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on this date of the publication of the declaration in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Distt.	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be Acquired for R.O.U. (in Hectares)
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Dewas	Dewas	Baroth Piplya	9	0.04
			128	0.05
			127	0.34
			146	0.13
			145	0.13
			143	0.11
			142	0.27
			136	0.16
			134	0.14
			135	0.01
			168	0.03
			312	0.28
			307	0.01

1	2	3	4	5
Dewas	Dewas	Baroth Piplya	306	0.01
			333	0.13
			332	0.07
			331	0.05
			337	0.13
			338	0.04
			339	0.06
			298	0.12
			340	0.02
			297	0.41
			344	0.25
			290	0.11
			289	0.17
			281	0.08
			280	0.03
			355	0.17
			357	0.04
			TOTAL	3.59
		Hawankheri	102	0.07
			100	0.13
			96	0.19
			94	0.19
			93	0.09
			92	0.17
			91	0.16
			87	0.33
			82	0.14
			80	0.01
			83	0.28
			77	0.13
			73	0.28
			72	0.25
			21	0.03
			23	0.01
			TOTAL	2.46
		Sutarkheri	69	0.03
			45	0.29
			43	0.13
			42	0.16
			41	0.37
			55	0.27
			39	0.12
			56	0.05
			TOTAL	1.42

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Dewas	Dewas	Binjana	1	0.06	Dewas	Dewas	Birakheri	7/1	0.30
			4/3	0.25				8	0.02
			5	0.27				6	0.03
			41	0.15				5	0.02
			42	0.21				4	0.13
			36	0.34				3	0.12
			42/302	0.15				2	0.24
			46	0.24				24	0.04
			52	0.03				23	0.01
			60/303	0.22				TOTAL	0.91
			60/2	0.33					
			58	0.22			Mendakichar	206	0.02
			59	0.33				204	0.02
			63	0.17				198	0.02
			64	0.16				203	0.01
			65	0.19				202	0.04
			66	0.03				200	0.11
			54	0.08				213/2	0.03
			76/307	0.01				213/1	0.19
			76	0.17				227	0.23
			75	0.33				226	0.12
			74	0.27				225	0.14
			69/4	0.55				224	0.01
			69/2	0.18				217	0.11
			71	0.31				222	0.08
			69/5	0.11				218	0.05
			69/6	0.10				219	0.11
			69/7	0.06				175	0.02
			69/8	0.08				164	0.04
			TOTAL	5.60				165	0.35
		Amona	8/1	0.23				160	0.01
			2	0.23				140	0.07
			3/1	0.48				63/2	0.11
			3/2	0.06				63/3	0.14
			4/1	0.01				66	0.43
			4/2	0.02				68	0.01
			3/3	0.16				73	0.25
			TOTAL	1.19				75	0.06
		Chandana	660	0.07				46	0.01
			656	0.05				76	0.19
			657	0.60				45	0.12
			658	0.02				82	0.09
			650	0.25				81	0.01
			649	0.22				80	0.24
			662	0.34					
			TOTAL	1.55					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Dewas	Dewas	Mendakichar	84/1	0.10	Dewas	Dewas	Nausarabad	55	0.26
			84/2	0.11				54	0.26
			86/2	0.26				58	0.37
			87	0.05				60	0.44
			88	0.24				65	0.29
			112	0.03				64	0.06
			95	0.01				66	0.03
			111	0.18				138	0.06
			97	0.26				80	0.08
			99	0.17				79	0.20
			100	0.18				75	0.28
			1/2	0.06				74	0.23
			TOTAL	5.09				203	0.08
		Nagukheri	264	0.07				TOTAL	2.77
			253	0.39			Kahukhri	1/3	0.01
			132/3	0.15				96	0.12
			252/2	0.01				95	0.48
			133	0.26				98	0.56
			134	0.03				97	0.47
			135	0.35				TOTAL	1.64
			239	0.17				[F. No. L-14014/1/05-G.P.(Pt-II)]	
			237	0.47				S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.	
			149	0.41				नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005	
			151	0.12				का. आ. 3567.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज	
			10	0.07				पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम,	
			217	0.26				1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम	
			212	0.06				कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत	
			211	0.21				सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या	
			210	0.15				का.आ.784(अ) तारीख 30-05-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न	
			167	0.15				अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश	
			168	0.17				राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से आर-	
			169	0.04				एल.एन.जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के	
			171	0.01				लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा	
			172	0.24				की थी;	
			163	0.08				और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख	
			TOTAL	3.87				7-7-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;	
		Karankheri	269	0.24				और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर	
			268/1	0.03				सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अननुज्ञात कर	
			268/2	0.04				दिया गया है;	
			73	0.05				और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा	
			TOTAL	0.36				(1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;	
		Nausarabad	12	0.03					
			49	0.10					

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाईन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित हैं, उस में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाईन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्दिष्ट देती है कि पाइपलाईन बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, पाइपलाईन बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विलसंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गांव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	देपालपुर	सिलोटिया	148	0.02
			150	0.14
			149	0.02
			153	0.20
			152	0.09
			154	0.10
			155	0.19
			156	0.01
			167	0.01
			162	0.39
			157	0.01
			163	0.29
			192	0.06
			193	0.03
			194	0.10
			195	0.10
			196	0.37
			197	0.24
			211	0.03

1	2	3	4	5
इन्दौर	देपालपुर	सिलोटिया	212	0.03
			215	0.04
			217	0.25
			219	0.16
			220	0.15
			221	0.19
			222	0.20
			237	0.20
			236	0.40
			241	0.03
			246	0.32
			257	0.04
			256	0.25
			248	0.03
			254	0.01
			255	0.01
			253	0.04
			252	0.10
			योग	4.85

[फा. सं. एल-14014/1/05-जी.पी. (भाग- II)]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3567.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 784(E) dated 30-05-2005 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transport of R-LNG through Jagoti to Pithampur and its Spur pipeline in the State of Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 7-7-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the Right of User in the

land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on this date of the publication of the declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Distt.	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be Acquired for R.O.U. (in Hectares)
1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Depalpur	Silotiya	148	0.02
			150	0.14
			149	0.02
			153	0.20
			152	0.09
			154	0.10
			155	0.19
			156	0.01
			167	0.01
			162	0.39
			157	0.01
			163	0.29
			192	0.06
			193	0.03
			194	0.10
			195	0.10
			196	0.37
			197	0.24
			211	0.03
			212	0.03
			215	0.04
			217	0.25
			219	0.16
			220	0.15
			221	0.19
			222	0.20
			237	0.20
			236	0.40
			241	0.03
			246	0.32
			257	0.04

1	2	3	4	5
Indore	Depalpur	Silotiya	256	0.25
			248	0.03
			254	0.01
			255	0.01
			253	0.04
			252	0.10
TOTAL			4.85	

[F. No. L-14014/1/05-G.P.(Pt-II)]

S.B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3568.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ.769(अ) तारीख 30-5-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गैस (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में कैलारश-मालनपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से आर.-एल.एन.जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ जनता को तारीख 25-06-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के संबंध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अननुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित हैं, उस में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि पाइपलाइनों बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन

की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए, पाइपलाईन बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगनों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गांव	सर्वे सं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
मुरैना	कैलारस	रिठौनियाँ	231म	0.12
			232	0.15
			235	0.16
			236	0.12
			238	0.16
			239	0.10
			240	0.14
			304	0.10
			303	0.15
			299	0.06
			300	0.01
			298	0.06
			297	0.02
			296	0.19
			295	0.03
			294	0.02
			367म	0.10
			352	0.09
			353	0.14
			373	0.16
			375	0.02
			379	0.01
			378	0.11
			403	0.07
			404	0.07
			405	0.13
			410	0.12
			409	0.02
			411	0.01
			408	0.12
			413	0.16
			414	0.02
			412	0.01
			योग	2.95

1	2	3	4	5
मुरैना	कैलारस	कैलारस	340	0.06
			336	0.12
			337	0.10
			338	0.01
			333	0.04
			332म	0.13
			381	0.09
			382	0.03
			392म	0.15
			383	0.01
			390म	0.17
			384म	0.08
			385	0.01
			389म	0.07
			387म	0.14
			388म	0.10
			471म	0.11
			469म	0.13
			466	0.04
			463	0.12
			453	0.01
			464म	0.02
			451	0.17
			449	0.05
			447	0.01
			662	0.01
			664	0.08
			677	0.17
			706	0.01
			705	0.22
			722	0.05
			700	0.04
			724	0.11
			726म	0.05
			727	0.23
			877	0.01
			728	0.10
			876म	0.03
			875म	0.03
			873	0.18
			874	0.22

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
मुरैना	कैलारस	कैलारस	1119	0.09	मुरैना	कैलारस	बडा गाँव	554	0.17
			1191म	0.13				556	0.04
			1190म	0.05				487	0.05
			1192	0.05				485	0.25
			1189म	0.15				484	0.13
			1183	0.07				483	0.22
			1185	0.13				467	0.09
			योग	4.18				575	0.09
		डोंगरपुर मानगढ़	173	0.02				466	0.05
			174	0.09				576	0.12
			175	0.01				465	0.02
			169	0.01				577	0.19
			176	0.02				578	0.17
			168	0.11				579	0.08
			178	0.13				421	0.02
			179	0.13				420	0.23
			187	0.02				419	0.29
			186	0.08				418म	0.03
			192	0.01				योग	2.90
			185	0.07			खेडा मानगढ़	30म	0.14
			184	0.04				24	0.08
			291	0.03				22	0.19
			300	0.12				18	0.10
			299	0.13				15	0.08
			298	0.08				14	0.08
			297	0.04				11	0.02
			296	0.10				121	0.02
			326	0.10				122	0.14
			333	0.11				131	0.06
			332	0.45				124एम	0.31
			331	0.17				126	0.03
			340	0.01				योग	1.25
			348	0.16			चमरगवां	50	0.02
			योग	2.24				51	0.21
		बडा गाँव	544	0.01				54	0.06
			546	0.01				47	0.03
			547	0.18				55	0.16
			458	0.07				56	0.02
			524	0.16				153	0.05
			551	0.16				156	0.09
			552	0.04				150	0.01
			555	0.03					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
मुरैना	कैलारस	चमरगां	149एम	0.05	मुरैना	कैलारस	पिपरीआ	182	0.14
			148	0.13				179	0.09
			147	0.01				178	0.12
			145	0.03				66	0.05
			180	0.12				65एम	0.31
			181	0.07				71	0.01
			182	0.03				43	0.04
			186	0.08				42	0.18
			193	0.11				39	0.02
			185	0.01				38	0.13
			194	0.13				37	0.11
			195	0.03				36	0.04
			198	0.11				78	0.14
			200	0.01				78/511	0.10
			201	0.07				22/512	0.09
			202	0.06				130	0.05
			203	0.05				128	0.06
			550	0.09				127	0.04
			212	0.01				योग	2.26
			214	0.18	मुरैना	कैलारस	स्यामदा	109	0.03
			218	0.03				107एम	0.10
			217	0.22				105	0.11
			255	0.31				106एम	0.15
			225	0.01				101	0.39
			246	0.14				100	0.02
			247	0.02				124	0.01
			244	0.16				119/1	0.09
			243	0.06				119/2	0.10
			305	0.17				119/3	0.10
			306एम	0.04				120	0.14
			307	0.02				121एम	0.08
			309	0.01				145एम	0.18
			308	0.10				147एम	0.34
			315	0.08				योग	1.84
			316	0.05	मुरैना	कैलारस	दीपरा	1349	0.23
			314	0.12				1353	0.15
			318	0.03				1371	0.07
			319	0.02				1356	0.01
			योग	3.62				1370	0.08
मुरैना	कैलारस	पिपरीआ	196	0.10				1369	0.05
			185	0.21				1357म	0.02
			188	0.11				1366	0.01
			181	0.12					

1	2	3	4	5
मुरैना	कैलारस	दीपैरा	1359	0.12
			1360म	0.23
			1361	0.14
			1362	0.01
			1334	0.10
			1332म	0.08
			1331	0.18
			1330	0.07
			1329म	0.08
			योग	1.63
मुरैना	कैलारस	मुकुंद	25	0.23
			26	0.11
			22	0.02
			27	0.02
			21	0.11
			19	0.13
			55	0.12
			54	0.19
			51	0.19
			52	0.07
			90	0.01
			योग	1.20

And whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the Right of User in the land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on this date of the publication of the declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Distt.	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be Acquired for R.O.U. (in Hectares)
1	2	3	4	5
Morena	Kailaras	Rithoniya	231M	0.12
			232	0.15
			235	0.16
			236	0.12
			238	0.16
			239	0.10
			240	0.14
			304	0.10
			303	0.15
			299	0.06
			300	0.01
			298	0.06
			297	0.02
			296	0.19
			295	0.03
			294	0.02
			367M	0.10
			352	0.09
			353	0.14
			373	0.16
			375	0.02
			379	0.01
			378	0.11
			403	0.07
			404	0.07
			405	0.13

[फा. सं. एल-14014/14/05-जी.पी.]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3568.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 769(E) dated 30-05-2005 issued under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transport of R-LNG through Kailaras—Malanpur spur pipeline project in the State of Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 25-06-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the Competent Authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Morena	Kailaras	Rithoniya	410	0.12	Morena	Kailaras	Kailaras	727	0.23
			409	0.02				877	0.01
			411	0.01				728	0.10
			408	0.12				876M	0.03
			413	0.16				875M	0.03
			414	0.02				873	0.18
			412	0.01				874	0.22
			TOTAL	2.95				1119	0.09
Morena	Kailaras	Kailaras	340	0.06				1191M	0.13
			336	0.12				1190M	0.05
			337	0.10				1192	0.05
			338	0.01				1189M	0.15
			333	0.04				1183	0.07
			332M	0.13				1185	0.13
			381	0.09				TOTAL	4.18
			382	0.03	Morena	Kailaras	Dongarpur	173	0.02
			392M	0.15			Mangarh	174	0.09
			383	0.01				175	0.01
			390M	0.17				169	0.01
			384M	0.08				176	0.02
			385	0.01				168	0.11
			389M	0.07				178	0.13
			387M	0.14				179	0.13
			388M	0.10				187	0.02
			471M	0.11				186	0.08
			469M	0.13				192	0.01
			466	0.04				185	0.07
			463	0.12				184	0.04
			453	0.01				291	0.03
			464M	0.02				300	0.12
			451	0.17				299	0.13
			449	0.05				298	0.08
			447	0.01				297	0.04
			662	0.01				296	0.10
			664	0.08				326	0.10
			677	0.17				333	0.11
			706	0.01				332	0.45
			705	0.22				331	0.17
			722	0.05				340	0.01
			700	0.04				348	0.16
			724	0.11				TOTAL	2.24
			726M	0.05					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Morena	Kailaras Chamargawan	309	0.01		Morena	Kailaras Syawata		119/2	0.10
		308	0.10					119/3	0.10
		315	0.08					120	0.14
		316	0.05					121M	0.08
		314	0.12					145M	0.18
		318	0.03					147M	0.34
		319	0.02					TOTAL	1.84
		TOTAL	3.62		Morena	Kailaras Dipera		1349	0.23
Morena	Kailaras Piparuwa	196	0.10					1353	0.15
		185	0.21					1371	0.07
		188	0.11					1356	0.01
		181	0.12					1370	0.08
		182	0.14					1369	0.05
		179	0.09					1357M	0.02
		178	0.12					1366	0.01
		66	0.05					1359	0.12
		65M	0.31					1360M	0.23
		71	0.01					1361	0.14
		43	0.04					1362	0.01
		42	0.18					1334	0.10
		39	0.02					1332M	0.08
		38	0.13					1331	0.18
		37	0.11					1330	0.07
		36	0.04					1329M	0.08
		78	0.14					TOTAL	1.63
		78/511	0.10		Morena	Kailaras Makunda		25	0.23
		22/512	0.09					26	0.11
		130	0.05					22	0.02
		128	0.06					27	0.02
		127	0.04					21	0.11
		TOTAL	2.26					19	0.13
Morena	Kailaras Syawata	109	0.03					55	0.12
		107M	0.10					54	0.19
		105	0.11					51	0.19
		106M	0.15					52	0.07
		101	0.39					90	0.01
		100	0.02					TOTAL	1.20
		124	0.01						
		119/1	0.09						

[F. No. L-14014/14/05-G.P.]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

1 2 3 4 5

का. आ. 3569.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 767(अ) तारीख, 13-5-2005 द्वारा, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर एवं स्पर पाइपलाइनों के माध्यम से आर. एल. एन. जी. के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त राजपत्रित अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 1-7-2005 तक उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और पाइपलाइन बिछाने के सम्बन्ध में जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों पर सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा विचार कर लिया गया है और उन्हें अनुज्ञात कर दिया गया है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निर्देश देती है कि पाइपलाइनें बिछाने के लिए भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय, पाइपलाइनें बिछाने का प्रस्ताव करने वाली गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, में निहित होगा और तदुपरि, भूमि में ऐसे उपयोग का अधिकार, इस प्रकार अधिरोपित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	गांव	सर्वे नं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल (हेक्टेयर में)
1	2	3	4	5
उज्जैन	महिदपुर	जगोटी	1521	0.08
			1520	0.04
			1524	0.01
		योग		0.13

उज्जैन	महिदपुर	बरखेड़ी बाजार	171	0.17
			170	0.11
			169	0.03
			168	0.05
			172	0.14
			179	0.04
			180	0.34
			167	0.01
			183	0.08
			194	0.05
			195	0.14
			193	0.01
			197	0.16
			200	0.17
			201	0.08
			202	0.03
			203	0.01
			204	0.05
			207	0.37
			205	0.27
			206	0.08
			210	0.06
			209	0.16
			563	0.01
			564	0.26

योग 2.90

घटिया

धन्नाखेड़ी

290	0.20
289	0.11
288	0.07
293	0.33
304	0.04
303	0.03
302	0.26
317	0.08
318	0.18
320	0.01
319/1	0.32
323	0.22
263	0.04
328	0.11
329	0.11
336	0.18
337	0.16

योग 2.45

नजरपुर

19	0.07
25	0.01
20	0.15
21	0.20
24	0.49

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
उपखेन	घटिया	नजरपुर			उपखेन	घटिया	नजरपुर		
			34/2	0.15				632	0.01
			34/1	0.13				634	0.29
			52	0.01				702/2	0.12
			50	0.03				639/2	0.12
			49	0.01				695/4	0.05
			51	0.14				695/3	0.10
			105	0.15				695/2	0.01
			104	0.01				640	0.06
			106	0.33				641	0.02
			101/2	0.11				690/1	0.01
			100/2	0.07				690/2	0.27
			99	0.01				692	0.01
			98	0.04				691	0.18
			110	0.31				1100	0.04
			114	0.04				1101	0.19
			113/1	0.37				1106	0.17
			112	0.02				1094	0.07
			162/2	0.01				1089	0.13
			163	0.13				1083	0.01
			518/2	0.09				1084	0.01
			518/1	0.13				1088	0.01
			519/2	0.05				1087	0.05
			519/1	0.16				1131	0.05
			517	0.08				1165	0.01
			521	0.14				1130	0.06
			522	0.13				1129	0.28
			514	0.12				1166	0.08
			509	0.26				1168	0.10
			510	0.13				1167	0.02
			508	0.10				1169	0.07
			506	0.01				1170	0.22
			505	0.20				1175/2	0.04
			504	0.24				1175/1	0.07
			463	0.04				1162/1	0.06
			544	0.02				1162/2	0.01
			545	0.22				1176/1	0.06
			546	0.14				1176/2	0.09
			547	0.05				1178/1	0.26
			552	0.15				1158	0.04
			551	0.16				1231	0.04
			550	0.01				1230	0.21
			590	0.02				1229	0.18
			622	0.13				1311	0.19
			623	0.13				1312	0.23
			624	0.02				1301	0.06
			625	0.09				1314	0.33
			626	0.08				1344/1	0.01

[illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
उज्जैन	उज्जैन	सुर्जनवास	24	0.05	उज्जैन	उज्जैन	देवान खेड़ी	30	0.09
			23	0.03				32	0.14
			20	0.45				31	0.21
			22	0.01				34	0.28
			19	0.30				171	0.04
			50/2	0.79				योग	2.01
			55	0.09			सेवरखेड़ी	10	0.29
			53	0.19				9	0.07
			116	0.20				14	0.11
			117/1	0.18				7	0.26
			117/2	0.04				6	0.12
			105	0.27				31	0.04
			104/1	0.18				34	0.11
			104/2	0.13				32/2/2	0.01
			120	0.12				32/2/1	0.14
			123	0.13				32/1	0.04
			124	0.24				33/1	0.21
			90	0.02				योग	1.40
			88	0.13			आलमपुर उखना	1	0.04
			87	0.46				योग	0.04
			130	0.02			बकानिया	263	0.04
			58	0.10				313	0.03
			56	0.17				264	0.23
			61	0.06				259	0.12
			65	0.20				254	0.16
			66	0.04				253	0.24
			70	0.20				248	0.15
			69	0.13				241	0.16
			77	0.03				240	0.01
			योग	4.96				200	0.57
		देवान खेड़ी	55	0.02				209	0.17
			3	0.01				208	0.05
			54	0.03				371	0.03
			4	0.07				372	0.36
			5	0.05				376	0.09
			6	0.18				893	0.03
			52	0.03				892/2	0.12
			53	0.01				892/1	0.15
			7	0.02				899	0.21
			8	0.01				900	0.02
			9	0.04				902	0.13
			23	0.18				903	0.03
			26	0.22				881	0.19
			21	0.26				879	0.17
			27	0.12				882	0.01

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
उज्जैन	उज्जैन	जयप्रसादपुर	107/2	0.25	उज्जैन	उज्जैन	नीमनवासा	280	0.02
			100	0.04				142	0.03
			103	0.48				141	0.10
			101	0.02				143	0.01
			योग	2.33				140	0.01
		बदरगा बेरसिया	87	0.03				139	0.02
			86	0.10				144	0.07
			85	0.30				145	0.14
			82/1	0.21				135	0.12
			82/2	0.11				115	0.03
			100	0.27				114	0.18
			101	0.27				113	0.18
			78	0.01				योग	2.28
			243	0.17			बड़ोदिया भौंड	14	0.03
			244	0.03				2	0.08
			245	0.12				3	0.12
			246	0.14				4	0.17
			247	0.20				5	0.09
			248	0.18				6	0.12
			250	0.12				1	0.04
			251	0.09				256	0.03
			252	0.17				257	0.16
			257	0.01				255	0.08
			256	0.12				259	0.21
			258	0.04				261	0.11
			259	0.01				262	0.11
			260	0.29				263	0.13
			273	0.20				267	0.24
			272	0.18				270	0.23
			279	0.02				273	0.35
			278	0.15				278	0.27
			277	0.02				286	0.31
			योग	3.56				296/2	0.31
		नीमनवासा	471	0.02				296/1	0.04
			469	0.16				295	0.11
			468	0.11				योग	3.34
			467	0.17			मताना खुर्द	1	0.04
			477	0.02				21	0.39
			486	0.06				20	0.22
			479	0.20				17	0.01
			480	0.13				18	0.33
			299	0.01				68	0.14
			284	0.19				67	0.07
			283	0.19				66	0.17
			281	0.08					
			288	0.03					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
उज्जैन	उज्जैन	मताना खुर्द	70	0.01	उज्जैन	उज्जैन	मताना कला	218	0.01	
			71	0.19				220	0.26	
			88	0.02				238	0.49	
			105/1	0.13				251	0.02	
			105/2	0.10				248	0.12	
			106	0.16				249	0.22	
			116	0.17				259	0.07	
			117	0.15				258	0.24	
			408	0.18				257	0.03	
			410	0.08				256	0.12	
			409	0.16				268	0.11	
			405	0.23				285	0.27	
			404	0.04				286	0.01	
			403	0.04				284/1	0.17	
			435	0.35				283	0.10	
			436	0.01				528	0.05	
			437	0.04				527	0.15	
			438	0.20				530	0.16	
			448	0.23				606	0.07	
			471	0.03				640	0.06	
			योग	3.89				641	0.41	
		मताना कला	2	0.04				642	0.01	
			24	0.29				658	0.06	
			25	0.04				633	0.02	
			44	0.22				663	0.08	
			57	0.21				664	0.14	
			58	0.01				665	0.18	
			60	0.17				678/2	0.17	
			59	0.02				677	0.27	
			97	0.18				681	0.07	
			93	0.14				684	0.23	
			92	0.23				683	0.04	
			98	0.02				685	0.03	
			91	0.07				689/1	0.16	
			99	0.04				689/2	0.12	
			174	0.03				688	0.24	
			173	0.21				694	0.49	
			172	0.01				695	0.15	
			170	0.09				697	0.04	
			131	0.02				योग	8.74	
			154/1	0.09				खजुरिया रुक्मरी	99	0.03
			153	0.18					100	0.17
			154/2	0.11					98	0.08
			164	0.31					28	0.06
			163	0.08					97	0.26
			161	0.07					26	0.02
			209	0.05						
			219	0.16						

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
ठप्पन	ठप्पन	मोरुखेड़ी			ठप्पन	ठप्पन	मोरुखेड़ी		
		24		0.01			67		0.05
		30		0.29			66		0.37
		29		0.17			69		0.02
		31		0.15			71		0.28
		32		0.07			70		0.13
		33		0.07			73		0.04
		34		0.01			72		0.40
		92		0.03			03		0.01
		35		0.30					
		84		0.25					
		83		0.12					
		373		0.02					
		161		0.11					
		162		0.28					
		170		0.02					
		171		0.10					
		175		0.07					
		347		0.07					
		351		0.16					
		350		0.07					
		354		0.10					
		355		0.18					
		348		0.04					
		420		0.02					
		422		0.18					
		421		0.05					
		423		0.02					
		424		0.20					
		426		0.17					
		425		0.01					
		430		0.26					
		431		0.15					
		436		0.01					
		435		0.01					
		433		0.04					
		434		0.18					
		448		0.25					
		452		0.10					
		योग		4.96					
		मोरुखेड़ी	26	0.01					
			34	0.11					
			35	0.13					
			33	0.01					
			30	0.06					
			36	0.10					
			38	0.17					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
उज्जैन	उज्जैन	जवासिमा कुम्हार	49	0.29	उज्जैन	उज्जैन	करोँदिया	421	0.02
			50	0.19				272	0.05
			51	0.13				273/2	0.02
			61	0.28				274	0.08
			70	0.07				273/1	0.01
			115	0.11				275	0.02
			116	0.14				311	0.06
			113	0.17				309	0.07
			111	0.27				313	0.05
			109	0.06				314	0.07
			108	0.02				317	0.06
			101	0.04				318/1	0.11
			100	0.05				324	0.02
			98	0.04				67	0.29
			97	0.03				329	0.12
			99	0.01				330/2	0.10
			264	0.07				330/1	0.03
			219	0.05				331/1	0.08
			220	0.11				333/2	0.09
			256	0.33				334	0.08
			255	0.19				336/1	0.16
			291	0.18				337	0.17
			292	0.07				340	0.14
			293	0.20				342/2	0.13
			295	0.09				44	0.02
			296	0.18				योग	2.38
			298	0.10					
			301	0.09					
			300	0.26					
			299	0.01					
			412/1	0.04					
			412/2	0.05					
			414	0.26					
			407	0.21					
			406	0.24					
			424	0.12					
			402	0.05					
			401	0.16					
			425	0.34					
			438	0.05					
		योग		5.78					
		करोँदिया	433/2	0.03					
			431	0.06					
			429	0.09					
			428	0.07					
			427	0.04					

[फा. सं. एल-14014/1/05-जी.पी. (भाग-1)]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S.O. 3569.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S. O. 767(E) dated the 13-05-2005 issued under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines for transport of R-LNG through Jagoti to Pithampur and its spur pipelines in the State of Madhya Pradesh by the GAIL (India) Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on 1-07-2005;

And whereas the objections received from the public to the laying of the pipeline have been considered and disallowed by the competent authority;

And whereas the Competent Authority has, under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, submitted its report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the Right of User in the lands specified in the Schedule;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines;

And, further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the Right of User in the said land for laying the pipelines shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, on the date of the publication of the declaration, in the GAIL (India) Limited, free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

District	Tehsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for ROU (In Hectare)
1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Mahidpur	Jagoti	1521	0.08
			1520	0.04
			1524	0.01
			TOTAL	0.13
		Barkhed	171	0.17
		Bazar	170	0.11
			169	0.03
			168	0.05
			172	0.14
			179	0.04
			180	0.34
			167	0.01
			183	0.08
			194	0.05
			195	0.14
			193	0.01
			197	0.16
			200	0.17
			201	0.08
			202	0.03
			203	0.01
			204	0.05
			207	0.37
			205	0.27
			206	0.08
			210	0.06
			209	0.16

1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Mahidpur	Barkhed	563	0.01
		Bazar	564	0.26
			TOTAL	2.90
		Ghatiya	290	0.20
		Dhanna	289	0.11
		Kheri	288	0.07
			293	0.33
			304	0.04
			303	0.03
			302	0.26
			317	0.08
			318	0.18
			320	0.01
			319/1	0.32
			323	0.22
			263	0.04
			328	0.11
			329	0.11
			336	0.18
			337	0.16
			TOTAL	2.45
		Najarpur	19	0.07
			25	0.01
			20	0.15
			21	0.20
			24	0.49
			34/2	0.15
			34/1	0.13
			52	0.01
			50	0.03
			49	0.01
			51	0.14
			105	0.15
			104	0.01
			106	0.33
			101/2	0.11
			100/2	0.07
			99	0.01
			98	0.04
			110	0.31
			114	0.04
			113/1	0.37
			112	0.02
			162/2	0.01
			163	0.13
			518/2	0.09

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Ghatiya	Najarpur	518/1	0.13	Ujjain	Ghatiya	Najarpur	1088	0.01
			519/2	0.05				1087	0.05
			519/1	0.16				1131	0.05
			517	0.08				1165	0.01
			521	0.14				1130	0.06
			522	0.13				1129	0.28
			514	0.12				1166	0.08
			509	0.26				1168	0.10
			510	0.13				1167	0.02
			508	0.10				1169	0.07
			506	0.01				1170	0.22
			505	0.20				1175/2	0.04
			504	0.24				1175/1	0.07
			463	0.04				1162/1	0.06
			544	0.02				1162/2	0.01
			545	0.22				1176/1	0.06
			546	0.14				1176/2	0.09
			547	0.05				1178/1	0.26
			552	0.15				1158	0.04
			551	0.16				1231	0.04
			550	0.01				1230	0.21
			590	0.02				1229	0.18
			622	0.13				1311	0.19
			623	0.13				1312	0.23
			624	0.02				1301	0.06
			625	0.09				1314	0.33
			626	0.08				1344/1	0.01
			632	0.01				1297	0.11
			634	0.29				1345	0.28
			702/2	0.12				1349	0.16
			639/2	0.12				1350	0.11
			695/4	0.05				1351	0.12
			695/3	0.10				1352	0.21
			695/2	0.01				1353	0.26
			640	0.06				1354	0.02
			641	0.02				1365	0.33
			690/1	0.01				1394	0.33
			690/2	0.27				1402	0.18
			692	0.01				1401	0.23
			691	0.18				1410	0.21
			1100	0.04				1413	0.01
			1101	0.19				1414	0.13
			1106	0.17				1416	0.01
			1094	0.07				1415	0.08
			1089	0.13				1418	0.09
			1083	0.01					
			1084	0.01					
								TOTAL	13.66

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Ghatiya	Nippaniya	341	0.02	Ujjain	Ghatiya	Ujjainiya	851	0.12
		Goyal	343	0.54				849	0.04
			353	0.04				1007	0.02
			367/3	0.22				1008	0.19
			369	0.21				1009	0.13
			TOTAL	1.03				1001	0.05
Ujjain	Ghatiya	Ujjainiya	3	0.01				1010	0.06
			4	0.08				1014	0.04
			5	0.08				1015	0.08
			6	0.16				1017	0.03
			9	0.11				1018	0.03
			13	0.11				1019	0.02
			14	0.09				1020	0.10
			15	0.08				1021	0.24
			15/1538	0.09				1022	0.28
			33	0.93				1584	0.05
			70	0.17				1583	0.20
			69	0.17				1581	0.17
			68	0.21				1640	0.17
			59	0.06				1639	0.15
			62	0.23				1638	0.24
			359	0.07				1627	0.09
			358	0.19				1629/2	0.07
			357	0.24				1629/1	0.13
			353	0.22				1628	0.05
			351	0.03				TOTAL	7.92
			440	0.01	Ujjain	Ujjain	Surjanwasa	24	0.05
			439	0.04				23	0.03
			438	0.05				20	0.45
			437	0.06				22	0.01
			436	0.01				19	0.30
			434	0.08				50/2	0.79
			433	0.07				55	0.09
			429	0.06				53	0.19
			428	0.07				116	0.20
			455	0.01				117/1	0.18
			459	0.01				117/2	0.04
			456	0.27				105	0.27
			457	0.16				104/1	0.18
			470	0.05				104/2	0.13
			911	0.19				120	0.12
			908	0.34				123	0.13
			905	0.01				124	0.24
			907	0.02				90	0.02
			906	0.04				88	0.13
			939	0.03				87	0.46
			940	0.08				130	0.02
			941	0.02				58	0.10
			892	0.05				56	0.17
			852	0.11					

[illegible]

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Ujjain Pingleshwar		31/3	0.02	Ujjain	Ujjain	Panth	697	0.07
			31/2	0.04			Piplai	699	0.05
			34	0.02				706	0.19
			37/2	0.03				TOTAL	3.24
			37/1	0.25			Jaiwanth	63/3	0.32
			127	0.09			Pur	64	0.19
			147	0.08				66	0.01
			145	0.23				67	0.03
			141/1	0.19				69	0.45
			142/3	0.01				78/1	0.08
			141/2	0.03				78/5	0.20
			142/1	0.01				78/4	0.22
			155	0.03				97	0.02
			157	0.19				107/1	0.02
			158	0.01				107/2	0.25
			161	0.14				100	0.04
			220	0.05				103	0.48
			221	0.09				101	0.02
			272	0.28				TOTAL	2.33
			276	0.01			Badarkha	87	0.03
			275	0.04			Berasiya	86	0.10
			274	0.19				85	0.30
			278	0.05				82/1	0.21
			283	0.07				82/2	0.11
			286	0.17				100	0.27
			285/1	0.12				101	0.27
			285/2	0.04				78	0.01
			284	0.11				243	0.17
			295	0.03				244	0.03
			TOTAL	3.47				245	0.12
Ujjain	Ujjain	Panth	506	0.06				246	0.14
		Piplai	507	0.13				247	0.20
			510	0.16				248	0.18
			511	0.17				250	0.12
			513	0.03				251	0.09
			519	0.10				252	0.17
			518	0.14				257	0.01
			517	0.18				256	0.12
			521/2	0.03				258	0.04
			516	0.13				259	0.01
			621	0.40				260	0.29
			624	0.18				273	0.20
			625	0.15				272	0.18
			526	0.01				279	0.02
			630/1	0.48				278	0.15
			628	0.06				277	0.02
			634	0.03				TOTAL	3.56
			695	0.23					
			698	0.16					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Ujjain	Neemarwana	471	0.02	Ujjain	Ujjain	Matana	1	0.04
			469	0.16			Khurd	21	0.39
			468	0.11				20	0.22
			467	0.17				17	0.01
			477	0.02				18	0.33
			486	0.06				68	0.14
			479	0.20				67	0.07
			480	0.13				66	0.17
			299	0.01				70	0.01
			284	0.19				71	0.19
			283	0.19				88	0.02
			281	0.08				150/1	0.13
			288	0.03				105/2	0.10
			280	0.02				106	0.16
			142	0.03				116	0.17
			141	0.10				117	0.15
			143	0.01				408	0.18
			140	0.01				410	0.08
			139	0.02				409	0.16
			144	0.07				405	0.23
			145	0.14				404	0.04
			135	0.12				403	0.04
			115	0.03				435	0.35
			114	0.18				436	0.01
			113	0.18				437	0.04
			TOTAL	2.28				438	0.20
		Badodiya	14	0.03				448	0.23
		Bhand	2	0.08				471	0.03
			3	0.12				TOTAL	3.89
			4	0.17			Matana	2	0.04
			5	0.09			Kala	24	0.29
			6	0.12				25	0.04
			1	0.04				44	0.22
			256	0.03				57	0.21
			257	0.16				58	0.01
			255	0.08				60	0.17
			259	0.21				59	0.02
			261	0.11				97	0.18
			262	0.11				93	0.14
			263	0.13				92	0.23
			267	0.24				98	0.02
			270	0.23				91	0.07
			273	0.35				99	0.04
			278	0.27				174	0.03
			286	0.31				173	0.21
			296/2	0.31				172	0.01
			296/1	0.04				170	0.09
			295	0.11				131	0.02
			TOTAL	3.34				154/1	0.09

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Ujjain	Matana	153	0.18	Ujjain	Ujjain	Khajuriya	98	0.08
		Kala	154/2	0.11			Pahawari	28	0.06
			164	0.31				97	0.26
			163	0.08				26	0.02
			161	0.07				24	0.01
			209	0.05				30	0.29
			219	0.16				29	0.17
			218	0.01				31	0.15
			220	0.26				32	0.07
			238	0.49				33	0.07
			251	0.02				34	0.01
			248	0.12				92	0.03
			249	0.22				35	0.30
			259	0.07				84	0.25
			258	0.24				83	0.12
			257	0.03				373	0.02
			256	0.12				161	0.11
			268	0.11				162	0.28
			285	0.27				170	0.02
			286	0.01				171	0.10
			284/1	0.17				175	0.07
			283	0.10				347	0.07
			528	0.05				351	0.16
			527	0.15				350	0.07
			530	0.16				354	0.10
			606	0.07				355	0.18
			640	0.06				348	0.04
			641	0.41				420	0.02
			642	0.01				422	0.18
			658	0.06				421	0.05
			633	0.02				423	0.02
			663	0.08				424	0.20
			664	0.14				426	0.17
			665	0.18				425	0.01
			678/2	0.17				430	0.26
			677	0.27				431	0.15
			681	0.07				436	0.01
			684	0.23				435	0.01
			683	0.04				433	0.04
			685	0.03				434	0.18
			689/1	0.16				448	0.25
			689/2	0.12				452	0.10
			688	0.24				TOTAL	4.96
			694	0.49			MoruKheri	26	0.01
			695	0.15				34	0.11
			697	0.04				35	0.13
			TOTAL	8.74				33	0.01
		Khajuriya	99	0.03				30	0.06
		Rahawari	100	0.17				36	0.10

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Ujjain	Ujjain	Moru Kheri	38	0.17	Ujjain	Ujjain	Jawasiya	70	0.07	
			67	0.05			Kumhar	115	0.11	
			66	0.37				116	0.14	
			69	0.02				113	0.17	
			71	0.28				111	0.27	
			70	0.13				109	0.06	
			73	0.04				108	0.02	
			72	0.40				101	0.04	
			03	0.01				100	0.05	
			TOTAL	1.89				38	0.04	
		Kithoda Rao	124	0.14				97	0.03	
			268	0.09				99	0.01	
			270	0.03				264	0.07	
			271	0.02				219	0.05	
			273	0.05				220	0.11	
			275/1	0.03				256	0.33	
			281	0.07				255	0.19	
			278	0.04				291	0.18	
			277	0.07				292	0.07	
			267	0.01				293	0.20	
			266	0.14				295	0.09	
			288	0.04				296	0.18	
			265	0.01				298	0.10	
			264	0.02				301	0.09	
			263	0.03				300	0.26	
			262	0.03				299	0.01	
			261	0.04				412/1	0.04	
			255	0.01				412/2	0.05	
			260	0.11				414	0.26	
			259	0.03				407	0.21	
			256/1	0.10				406	0.24	
			256/2	0.18				424	0.12	
			257	0.18				402	0.05	
			321	0.16				401	0.16	
			251	0.02				425	0.34	
			250	0.08				438	0.05	
			328	0.27				TOTAL	5.78	
			329	0.37				Karondiya	433/2	0.03
			330	0.10					431	0.06
			322	0.01					429	0.09
			TOTAL	2.38					428	0.07
		Jawasiya	41	0.02					427	0.04
		Kumhar	39	0.01					421	0.02
			42	0.26					272	0.05
			40	0.14					273/2	0.02
			49	0.29					274	0.08
			50	0.19					273/1	0.01
			51	0.13						
			61	0.28						

1	2	3	4	5
Ujjain	Ujjain	Karondiya	275	0.02
			311	0.06
			309	0.07
			313	0.05
			314	0.07
			317	0.06
			318/1	0.11
			324	0.02
			67	0.29
			329	0.12
			330/2	0.10
			330/1	0.03
			331/1	0.08
			333/2	0.09
			334	0.08
			336/1	0.16
			337	0.17
			340	0.14
			342/2	0.13
			44	0.02
			TOTAL	2.38

[F. No. L-14014/1/05-G.P.-(Part I)]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3570.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 1011(अ), तारीख 30 अगस्त, 2003 को अधिकांश करते हुए सिवाए उन बातों के जो ऐसे अधिक्रमण से पूर्व की गई हैं, या जिन्हें करने का लोप किया गया है, श्री बी.बी. जोशी को मैसर्स गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा महाराष्ट्र राज्य में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिए नियुक्त किया;

और उक्त श्री बी.बी. जोशी का स्थानांतरण हो गया है और श्री के. एन. कशिवले को उनके पद पर नियुक्त किया गया है;

और उक्त श्री बी.बी. जोशी मैसर्स गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड के साथ प्रतिनियुक्ति समाप्त हो गई है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 1011(अ), तारीख 30 अगस्त, 2003 को अधिकांश करते हुए, नीचे दी गई अनुसूची के स्तंभ (1) में वर्णित व्यक्ति को उक्त मैसर्स गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए निम्नलिखित अनुसूची के स्तंभ (2) में वर्णित क्षेत्र में

उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिए नियुक्त करती है।

अनुसूची

व्यक्ति का नाम और पता	अधिकारिता का क्षेत्र
(1)	(2)
श्री के.एन. कशिवले, उपजिलाधिकारी, मैसर्स गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड में प्रतिनियुक्ति पर सेक्टर-8बी, 3डी 2, सी.बी.डी., बेलापुर, नवी मुम्बई-400614 (महाराष्ट्र)	सम्पूर्ण महाराष्ट्र राज्य

[फा. सं. एल-14014/21/05-जी.पी.]

एस.बी. मण्डल, अपर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 2005

S.O. 3570.—Whereas, in pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government vide Notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas vide S.O. 1011(E), dated 30 August, 2003 appointed Shri V.B. Joshi, Deputy Collector to perform the functions of the competent authority under said Act for laying of the pipeline by M/s. GAIL (India) Limited in the state of Maharashtra;

And, whereas, Shri V.B. Joshi has been transferred and Shri K.N. Kashivale has been posted as his incumbent;

And, whereas, the deputation of the said Shri V.B. Joshi with M/s. GAIL (India) Limited has come to an end;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of clause (a) of Section (2) of the said Act and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas vide S.O. 1011(E), dated 30 August, 2003, the Central Government hereby authorises the person mentioned in column (1) of the schedule given below to perform the functions of the Competent Authority under the said Act for laying pipelines by the said M/s. GAIL (India) Limited in the area mentioned in column (2) of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

Name and Address of the person	Area of Jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Shri K.N. Kashivale, Dy. Collector on deputation to M/s. GAIL (India) Limited, Sector-8B, 3D2, CBD, Belapur, Navi Mumbai-400614 (Maharashtra)	Whole State of the Maharashtra

[F. No. L-14014/21/05-G.P.]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3571.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मुन्द्रा (गुजरात) से दिल्ली तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी भूमि में, जो इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन - - - (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

फोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको इस अधिसूचना से युक्त भारत के राजपत्र की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के सम्बन्ध में श्री पी. कं. मल्होत्रा, डानिक्स, एस. डी. एम. (नजफगढ़) और सक्षम प्राधिकारी, हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चावला रोड, नजफगढ़, नई दिल्ली - 110043 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील: पंजाबीबाग		जिला: रामपुरा			राज्य: दिल्ली		
गाँव	का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुसतिल संख्या	खसरा/किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
					हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. टीकरी कला		120	6	18/2	00	00	25
				19	00	09	45
				22	00	04	90
				23	00	08	52
		15	3	00	06	40	
			4	00	03	06	
			6/2	00	00	25	
			7	00	12	60	
			14/1	00	02	52	
			14/2	00	01	40	
			15/1	00	05	22	

तहसील: पंजाबीबाग		जिला: रामपुरा		राज्य: दिल्ली		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुसतिल संख्या	खसरा/किला संख्या	श्रेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. टीकरी कलां (जारी...)	120	18	15/2	00	01	08
			24/2	00	00	25
			25	00	10	98
			4	00	00	25
			5	00	14	04
			6	00	02	62
		19	7/2	00	00	25
			8/3	00	00	25
			8/4	00	02	27
			9/1	00	02	40
			9/2	00	10	44
			10/1	00	11	10
			10/2	00	00	80
			13	00	04	96
			14	00	00	25
			490	00	01	08
			500	00	10	80
			509	00	01	44
			1332	00	01	80
			1333	00	01	32
			1333/1	00	01	65
			1372	00	03	35
			1381	00	01	28

[फ़. सं. आर-31015/4/2005-ओ.आर-II]

- हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 2005

S. O. 3571.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Mundra (Gujarat) to Delhi, a pipeline should be laid by Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipeline — (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule, may, within twenty one days from the date on which copies of the Gazette of India containing this notification are made available to the public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri V.K Malhotra, DANICS, S.D.M. (Nazafgarh). — cum-Competent Authority, Mundra - Delhi Petroleum Product Pipeline, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, Chawla Road, Nazafgarh, New Delhi – 110043.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : PUNJABIBAGH		District : RAMPURA			State : DELHI		
Name of	Village	Hadbast No.	Mustil No.	Khasara / Killa No.	Area		
					Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. Tikri Kalan		120	6	18/2	00	00	25
				19	00	09	45
				22	00	04	90
				23	00	08	52
			15	3	00	06	40
				4	00	03	06
				6/2	00	00	25
				7	00	12	60
				14/1	00	02	52
				14/2	00	01	40
				15/1	00	05	22
				15/2	00	01	08
				24/2	00	00	25
			18	25	00	10	98
				4	00	00	25
				5	00	14	04
				6	00	02	62
			19	7/2	00	00	25
				8/3	00	00	25
				8/4	00	02	27
				9/1	00	02	40
				9/2	00	10	44

Tehsil : PUNJABIBAGH		District : RAMPURA		State : DELHI		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustil No.	Khasara / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. Tikri Kalan(Contd.)	120		10/1	00	11	10
			10/2	00	00	80
			13	00	04	96
			14	00	00	25
			490	00	01	08
			500	00	10	80
			509	00	01	44
			1332	00	01	80
			1333	00	01	32
			1333/1	00	01	65
			1372	00	03	35
			1381	00	01	28

[No. R-31015/4/2005-O.R.-II]

HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3572.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में मांगल्या (इंदौर) संस्थापन से हरियाणा राज्य में पियाला तथा दिल्ली राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र में बिजवासन तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए भारत पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा एक विस्तार पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी भूमि में, जो इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको इस अधिसूचना से युक्त भारत के राजपत्र की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के सम्बन्ध में श्री लाल सिंह, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुम्बई - मांगल्या पाइपलाइन विस्तार परियोजना, भारत पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, प्लॉट नं० - 590, सेक्टर 21 ए, फरीदाबाद- 121001 (हरियाणा) को लिखित रूप में अपक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : बल्लभगढ़

जिला : फरीदाबाद

राज्य : हरियाणा

क्र०	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
1.	हरफला	26/16/2	0.0515
		17	0.0685
		18	0.0305
		23	0.0230
		25/20	0.0070
2.	पियाला	12/18	0.0480
		21	0.0050
		22	0.1440
		23	0.0960
		19/ 1	0.1520
		20/ 5	0.0610
		6	0.0940
		7	0.1470
		8/1	0.0100
		12	0.0835
		13/1	0.1115
		13/2	0.0230
		19	0.0635
		20	0.1520
		21/16	0.0710
		23	0.0315
		24	0.1520
		25	0.0785
		107 (रास्ता)	0.0075
3.	मोहला	54/17	0.0420
		18	0.0180
		25	0.0090
		55/15	0.0025
		18	0.0095
		19	0.0195
		20	0.0155
		21	0.0475
		56/ 6	0.0050
		11	0.0435
		12	0.0550
		13	0.0520
		57/ 8	0.0070
		9	0.0625
		10	0.0650
4.	सीकरी	48/22	0.0025
		23	0.0835

क्र०	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
4.	सीकरी (जारी ...)	49/ 1	0.0785
		2	0.1515
		3	0.0580
		10	0.0810
		50/ 6	0.1400
		7	0.0025
		13	0.0200
		14/1	0.0660
		14/2	0.0410
		15/2	0.0190
		18	0.1130
		19	0.0630
		21	0.1035
		59/ 23	0.0220
		24	0.0500
		25	0.0390
		60/ 16	0.0055
		21	0.0800
		22/1	0.0160
		22/2	0.0175
		23	0.0590
		24	0.0530
		61/ 4	0.0125
		5/1	0.0050
		5/2	0.1030
		7	0.0140
		8/1	0.0045
		8/2	0.0427
		12	0.0670
		20	0.0540
5.	झीग	19/ 22	0.0110
		31/ 18	0.0130
		23	0.0230
		40/ 3	0.0285
		53/ 3	0.0840
		17	0.0200
		24	0.0250
		61/ 4	0.0030
		7	0.0040
		16	0.0190
		25	0.0270
		73/ 20	0.0155
		21	0.0650

क्र०	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
5.	झीग (जारी...)	74/ 5	0.0040
		16	0.0795
		80/11	0.0045
		20	0.0110
		21	0.0090
6.	सागरपुर	32/21	0.0065
		33/18	0.0760
		19	0.0205
		25	0.0160
		34/15	0.0640
		37/ 2	0.0080
		8	0.0040
		9	0.0925
		17	0.0140
		25	0.0330
		42/ 1	0.0115
		9	0.0055
		12	0.0270
		18	0.0320
		19	0.0160
		24	0.0070
7.	पहलादपुर	18/13	0.0050
		18	0.0240
		23	0.0110
		21/14	0.0100
		17	0.0440
		24	0.0250
		31/15	0.0145
		16	0.0310
		34/11	0.0275
		20	0.0520
		41/ 9	0.0300
		12/1	0.0100
		12/3	0.0140
		12/4	0.0025
		18	0.0125
		23	0.0560
		43/ 4	0.0025
		7	0.0420
		14	0.0060
		16	0.0520
		25	0.0060
		48/ 1	0.0415

क्र०	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	2	3	4
7.	पहलादपुर (जारी ...)	48/10	0.0090
		12	0.0270
		19/1	0.0040
		19/2	0.0170
		23	0.0070
		51/ 3	0.0235
		179 (रास्ता)	0.0150
		180 (रास्ता)	0.0055

[फ. सं. आर-31015/2/2005-ओ.आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 2005

S. O. 3572.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Manglya (Indore) terminal in the State of Madhya Pradesh, an extension pipeline to Piyala in the State of Haryana and Bijwasan in the NCT of Delhi should be laid by the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule, may, within twenty one days from the date on which copies of the Gazette of India containing this notification are made available to the public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri LAL SINGH, Competent Authority, Mumbai - Manglya Pipeline Extension Project, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Plot No. 590, Sector 21A, Faridabad-121001 (Haryana).

SCHEDULE

TEHSIL: BALLABHGARH		DISTRICT: FARIDABAD		STATE: HARYANA	
S.NO.	NAME OF VILLAGE	SURVEY NO.		AREA IN HECTARE	
1	2	3		4	
1.	HARFALA	26/16/2		0.0515	
		17		0.0685	
		18		0.0305	
		23		0.0230	
		25/20		0.0070	
2.	PIYALA	12/18		0.0480	
		21		0.0050	
		22		0.1440	
		23		0.0960	

S.NO.	NAME OF VILLAGE	SURVEY NO.	AREA IN HECTARE
1	2	3	4
4.	PIYALA (Contd...)	19/ 1	0.1520
		20/ 5	0.0610
		6	0.0940
		7	0.1470
		8/1	0.0100
		12	0.0835
		13/1	0.1115
		13/2	0.0230
		19	0.0635
		20	0.1520
		21/16	0.0710
		23	0.0315
		24	0.1520
		25	0.0785
		107 (Rasta)	0.0075
3.	MOHLA	54/17	0.0420
		18	0.0180
		25	0.0090
		55/15	0.0025
		18	0.0095
		19	0.0195
		20	0.0155
		21	0.0475
		56/ 6	0.0050
		11	0.0435
		12	0.0550
		13	0.0520
		57/ 8	0.0070
		9	0.0625
		10	0.0650
4.	SEEKRI	48/22	0.0025
		23	0.0835
		49/ 1	0.0785
		2	0.1515
		3	0.0580
		10	0.0810
		50/ 6	0.1400
		7	0.0025
		13	0.0200
		14/1	0.0660
		14/2	0.0410
		15/2	0.0190
		18	0.1130
		19	0.0630
		21	0.1035
		59/ 23	0.0220
		24	0.0500
		25	0.0390
		60/ 16	0.0055
		21	0.0800
		22/1	0.0160

S.NO.	NAME OF VILLAGE	SURVEY NO.	AREA IN HECTARE
1	2	3	4
4.	SEEKRI (constd...)	22/2	0.0175
		23	0.0590
		24	0.0530
		61/ 4	0.0125
		5/1	0.0050
		5/2	0.1030
		7	0.0140
		8/1	0.0045
		8/2	0.0427
		12	0.0670
		20	0.0540
5.	DEEG	19/ 22	0.0110
		31/ 18	0.0130
		23	0.0230
		40/ 3	0.0285
		53/ 3	0.0840
		17	0.0200
		24	0.0250
		61/ 4	0.0030
		7	0.0040
		16	0.0190
		25	0.0270
		73/ 20	0.0155
		21	0.0650
		74/ 5	0.0040
		16	0.0795
		80/ 11	0.0045
		20	0.0110
		21	0.0090
6.	SAGARPUR	32/ 21	0.0065
		33/ 18	0.0760
		19	0.0205
		25	0.0160
		34/ 15	0.0640
		37/ 2	0.0080
		8	0.0040
		9	0.0925
		17	0.0140
		25	0.0330
		42/ 1	0.0115
		9	0.0055
		12	0.0270
		18	0.0320
		19	0.0160
		24	0.0070
7.	PAHLADPUR	18/ 13	0.0050
		18	0.0240
		23	0.0110
		21/ 14	0.0100
		17	0.0440
		24	0.0250

S.NO.	NAME OF VILLAGE	SURVEY NO.	AREA IN HECTARE
1	2	3	4
7.	PAHLADPUR (Contd...)	31/15	0.0145
		16	0.0310
		34/11	0.0275
		20	0.0520
		41/ 9	0.0300
		12/1	0.0100
		12/3	0.0140
		12/4	0.0025
		18	0.0125
		23	0.0560
		43/ 4	0.0025
		7	0.0420
		14	0.0060
		16	0.0520
		25	0.0060
		48/ 1	0.0415
		48/10	0.0090
		12	0.0270
		19/1	0.0040
		19/2	0.0170
		23	0.0070
		51/ 3	0.0235
		179 (Rasta)	0.0150
		180 (Rasta)	0.0055

[No. R-31015/2/2005-O.R.-II]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का.आ. 3573.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 1909 तारीख 25 मई, 2005, जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 28 मई, 2005, में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में मुन्दा-दिल्ली पेट्रोलियम उत्पाद पाइपलाइन के माध्यम से गुजरात राज्य में मुन्दा से दिल्ली तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 6 जुलाई, 2005, को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है :

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए, इस मंत्रालय के सहमति पत्र सं. आर - 31015/7/03 ओ.आस्-III दिनांक 25/11/2004 द्वारा लगाई गई शर्तों के अधीन सभी विलिंगनों से मुक्त, डिस्ट्रिक्ट पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील: बहादुरगढ़		जिला: झज्जर		राज्य: हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुसतिल संख्या	असरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. आसोदा टोहरान	28		3462			
			367-2968-2969	00	08	82
			1029	00	00	50
			1102	00	00	10
			3083/1105	00	10	56
2. बराही	40		2340	00	00	79
			2343	00	03	26
			2344	00	01	38
			2361	00	00	63
			19/3	00	00	21
3. बाहमनोली	35	73	22/1	00	00	10
			22/2	00	01	28
			20/2	00	00	45
			22	00	00	57
			24/2	00	00	35
		90	25	00	04	14
			11	00	00	36
			12	00	00	74
			16	00	00	31
			17	00	00	77
		98	2/1	00	00	39
			2/2	00	00	28
			3/1	00	00	16
			2/1/2	00	00	33
			3/2	00	00	31

तहसील: बहादुरगढ़		जिला: झुज्जर		राज्य: हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुसतिल संख्या	असरा/ किला संख्या	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
4. परनाला	36	17	20	00	00	15
		19	2/2	00	00	24
			2/3	00	03	17
	38	35	2	00	01	02
		57	4/1	00	00	55
		58	19	00	04	00

[फा. सं. आर-31015/56/2004-ओ.आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3573.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 1909 dated the 25th May, 2005, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 28th May, 2005, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of petroleum products from Mundra in the State of Gujarat to Delhi through Mundra-Delhi Petroleum Product Pipeline by Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 6th July, 2005;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of publication of declaration, in Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances, subject to the conditions imposed vide this Ministry's consent letter no. R-31015/7/03 OR- II dated 25-11-2004.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil :Bahadurgarh		District : Jhajjar		State : Haryana		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustil No.	Khasara / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. ASUDHA TODRAN	28		3462	00	08	82
			367-2968-2969			
			1029	00	00	50
			1102	00	00	10
			3083/1105	00	10	56
2. BARAHI	40		2340	00	00	79
			2343	00	03	26
			2344	00	01	38
			2361	00	00	63
			19/3	00	00	21
3. BAMNOLI	35	73	22/1	00	00	10
			22/2	00	01	28
			20/2	00	00	45
			22	00	00	57
			24/2	00	00	35
		90	25	00	04	14
			11	00	00	36
			12	00	00	74
			16	00	00	31
			17	00	00	77
		98	2/1	00	00	39
			2/2	00	00	28
			3/1	00	00	16
			2/1/2	00	00	33
			3/2	00	00	31
4. PARNALA	36	17	20	00	00	15
		19	2/2	00	00	24
			2/3	00	03	17
		35	2	00	01	02

अनुसूची

तालुका : अमीरगढ		जिला : बन्सगाँव		तहसील : मुजरात		
क्रम सं.	जोब का नाम	असरा सं.	उप खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
1	2	3	4	हेक्टेयर	एकर	वर्ग मीटर
1.	सरोत्रा	234	पी4	0	00	70
		234	पी2	0	00	72
		235	पी2	0	03	95

[फा. सं. आर-31015/41/2004-ओ.आर.-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3574.— Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 1913 dated the 26th May, 2005, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 28th May, 2005, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of petroleum products from Mundra in the State of Gujarat to Delhi through Mundra-Delhi Petroleum Product Pipeline by Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 5th July, 2005;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of publication of this declaration, in Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances, subject to the conditions imposed vide this Ministry's consent letter no. R-31015/7/03.OR- II dated 25-11-2004.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : AMIRGADH		District : BANASKANTHA		State : GUJARAT		
Sr. No.	Name of Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. SAROTRA		234	P4	0	00	70
		234	P2	0	00	72
		235	P2	0	03	95

[No. R-31015/41/2004-O.R.-II]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3575.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 1914 तारीख 27 मई, 2005, जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 28 मई 2005 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में मुद्रा-दिल्ली पेट्रोलियम उत्पाद पाइपलाइन के माध्यम से गुजरात राज्य में मुद्रा से दिल्ली तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 5 जुलाई, 2005, को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए, इस मंत्रालय के सहमति पत्र सं. आर - 31015/7/03 ओ.आर.-II दिनांक 25/11/2004 द्वारा लगाई गई शर्तों के अध्याधीन सभी वित्तीयों से मुक्त, हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तालुका : पालन		जिला : पालन		राज्य : गुजरात		
क्रम सं.	नाम का नाम	जस्ता सं.	उप खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एकर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	भाटसज	45	पी	0	08	20
		44	1पी1	0	12	57
		44	2पी1	0	00	30
		43	पी1पी	0	21	55
		42	पी3	0	00	20
		42	पी2पी	0	20	83
		52		0	22	80
		41	1पी2	0	05	34
		41	1पी1पी	0	21	60
		41	2	0	07	48
		40		0	12	78
		39		0	39	92
		13	4	0	00	20
		13	5	0	07	10
		15	3	0	06	77
		15	4	0	14	43
		16	पी	0	24	13
		1	पी4	0	06	23
		381	पी1	0	13	36
		381	पी2	0	31	06
		373		0	04	10
		372	10पी2	0	03	74
		372	9	0	06	45
		372	8पी1	0	05	36
		372	2पी1	0	02	96
		372	8	0	00	60
		372	4	0	13	05
		372	5	0	00	40
		380	1	0	08	10
		282	अ/पी1	0	11	44
		283		0	00	40
		271	पी3	0	22	15
		272		0	00	63
		273	पी2पी	0	17	64
		258		0	25	38
		259		0	01	37
		257	पी2	0	10	60
		255	पी2	0	25	52
		254		0	22	38

तालुका : पाटण		जिला : पाटण		राज्य : गुजरात		
क्रमा सं.	गाँव का नाम	खसरा सं.	उप खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
1	2	3	4	हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्ग मीटर
1.	भाटसण (जारी....)	253	पी1	0	00	20
		251		0	21	38
		250	पी5	0	15	93
		250	पी1	0	04	59
		250	पी3	0	10	69
		नाला खसरा संख्या 250/पी3 और 235/पी4 के बीच में		0	06	48
		235	पी4	0	21	03
		234	पी3पी	0	02	34
		233	पी3	0	00	20
		233	पी1	0	12	29
		83	पी	0	17	08
		82	3	0	00	20
		82	2	0	24	13
		92		0	02	67
		91	पी1	0	07	61
		91	पी2	0	12	83
		90	2पी2	0	30	15
		89		0	11	29
		98	3	0	10	33
		98	4	0	10	30
		99		0	22	80
		104		0	16	78
		105	1	0	17	10
		103	पी3	0	12	83
		103	पी4	0	10	33
		33		0	39	20
		32		0	13	18
		रास्ता खसरा संख्या 32 और 112 के बीच में		0	01	42
		112		0	00	20
		114	2पी2	0	07	48
		114	2पी1	0	09	97
		114	1	0	22	43
		129	पी2	0	00	78
		128	2	0	03	92
		128	1 पी	0	10	36
		127		0	00	59
		126		0	18	77
		118	पी2	0	05	63
		125	पी1	0	00	96
		125	पी2	0	15	92
		119	पी1	0	17	46

तालुका : पाटण		जिला : पाटण		राज्य : गुजरात		
क्रम सं.	नौव का नाम	खसरा सं.	उप खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एकर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	खारेडा (जारी...)	119	पी3	0	23	32
		122		0	00	20
		121	2पी1	0	10	32
		120		0	06	77
		रास्ता खसरा संख्या 120 और 157/2 के बीच में			01	78
		157	2	0	14	96
		157	1	0	03	52
		166	2	0	20	17
		166	1	0	08	28
		164		0	13	19
		165	पी3	0	06	44
		रास्ता खसरा संख्या 165/पी3 और 190/पी1 के बीच में			03	06
		190	पी1	0	19	60
		190	पी2	0	10	69
		191	1पी1	0	07	48
		201	1पी	0	13	17
		201	2	0	08	19
		201	3	0	12	47
		202		0	08	50
		203	1	0	00	20
		199		0	27	54
		204		0	00	30
		197		0	29	34
		नाला खसरा संख्या 197 और 244 के बीच में			06	77
		244		0	13	54
		243		0	00	23
		245		0	11	76

[फ. सं. आर-31015/37/2004-ओ.आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3575.—Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 1914 dated the 27th May, 2005, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 28th May, 2005, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of petroleum products from Mundra in the State of Gujarat to Delhi through Mundra-Delhi Petroleum Product Pipeline by Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 5th July, 2005;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government :

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of publication of this declaration, in Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances, subject to the conditions imposed vide this Ministry's consent letter no. R-31015/7/03 OR- II dated 25-11-2004.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : PATAN		District : PATAN		State : GUJARAT		
Sr. No.	Name of Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	BHATSAN	45	P	0	08	20
		44	1P1	0	12	57
		44	2P1	0	00	30
		43	P1P	0	21	55
		42	P3	0	00	20
		42	P2P	0	20	83
		52		0	22	80
		41	1P2	0	05	34
		41	1P1P	0	21	60
		41	2	0	07	48
		40		0	12	78
		39		0	39	92
		13	4	0	00	20
		13	5	0	07	10
		15	3	0	06	77
		15	4	0	14	43
		16	P	0	24	13
		1	P4	0	06	23
		381	P1	0	13	36
		381	P2	0	31	06
		373		0	04	10
		372	10P2	0	03	74
		372	9	0	06	45
		372	8P1	0	05	36
		372	2P1	0	02	96
		372	8	0	00	60

Taluk : PATAN		District : PATAN		State : GUJARAT		
Sr. No.	Name of Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
				Hectare	Ac.	Sq.intr.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. BHATSAN (Contd...)		372	4	0	13	05
		372	5	0	00	40
		380	1	0	08	10
		282	A/P1	0	11	44
		283		0	00	40
		271	P3	0	22	15
		272		0	00	63
		273	P2P	0	17	64
		258		0	25	38
		259		0	01	37
		257	P2	0	10	60
		255	P2	0	25	52
		254		0	22	38
		253	P1	0	00	20
		251		0	21	38
		250	P5	0	15	93
		250	P1	0	04	59
		250	P3	0	10	69
		Nala in Between Survey No. 250/P3 & 235/P4		0	06	48
		235	P4	0	21	03
		234	P3P	0	02	34
		233	P3	0	00	20
		233	P1	0	12	29
2. KHAREDA		83	P	0	17	08
		82	3	0	00	20
		82	2	0	24	13
		92		0	02	67
		91	P1	0	07	61
		91	P2	0	12	83
		90	2P2	0	30	15
		89		0	11	29
		98	3	0	10	33
		98	4	0	10	30
		99		0	22	80
		104		0	16	78
		105	1	0	17	10
		103	P3	0	12	83
		103	P4	0	10	33
		33		0	39	20
		32		0	13	18
		Cart Track in Between Survey No. 32 & 112		0	01	42
		112		0	00	20
		114	2P2	0	07	48
		114	2P1	0	09	97

Taluk : PATAN		District : PATAN		State : GUJARAT		
Sr. No.	Name of Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
				Hectare	Acre	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. KHAREDA (Contd...)						
		114	1	0	22	43
		129	P2	0	00	78
		128	2	0	03	92
		128	1P	0	10	36
		127		0	00	59
		126		0	18	77
		118	P2	0	05	63
		125	P1	0	00	96
		125	P2	0	15	92
		119	P1	0	17	46
		119	P3	0	23	32
		122		0	00	20
		121	2P1	0	10	32
		120		0	06	77
		Cart Track in Between Survey No. 120 & 157/2		0	01	78
		157	2	0	14	96
		157	1	0	03	52
		166	2	0	20	17
		166	1	0	08	28
		164		0	13	19
		165	P3	0	06	44
		Cart Track in Between Survey No. 165/P3 & 190/P1		0	03	06
		190	P1	0	19	60
		190	P2	0	10	69
		191	1P1	0	07	48
		201	1P	0	13	17
		201	2	0	08	19
		201	3	0	12	47
		202		0	08	50
		203	1	0	00	20
		199		0	27	54
		204		0	00	30
		197		0	29	34
		Nala in Between Survey No. 197 & 244		0	06	77
		244		0	13	54
		243		0	00	23
		245		0	11	76

[No. R-31015/37/2004-O.R.-II]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3576.—**केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है)** की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 1910 तारीख 25 मई, 2005, जो भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 28 मई 2005, में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में मुन्दा-दिल्ली पेट्रोलियम उत्पाद पाइपलाइन के माध्यम से गुजरात राज्य में मुन्दा से दिल्ली तक पेट्रोलियम-उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 6 जुलाई , 2005, को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात, और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि उक्त भूमि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए अपेक्षित है, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने का विनिश्चय किया है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख को केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए, इस मंत्रालय के सहमति पत्र सं. आर - 31015/7/03 ओ.आर.-II दिनांक 25/11/2004 द्वारा लगाई गई शर्तों के अध्याधीन सभी विल्लंगनों से मुक्त, हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील: फरुखनगर		जिला: गुड़गाँव		राज्य: हरियाणा		
गाँव का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुसतिल संख्या	खसरा/किला संख्या	श्रेत्रफल		
				हेक्टेयर	एयर	वर्गमीटर
1. फरीदपुर	15	8	1	00	00	55
2. कारोला	14	27	21	00	01	41
		28	25/2	00	00	28
		43	5	00	00	98
			189	00	00	60

तहसील: फरुखनगर		जिला: गुड़गाँव			राज्य: हरियाणा		
गाँव	का नाम	हदबस्त संख्या	मुसतिल संख्या	खसरा/किला संख्या	श्रेत्रफल		
					हेक्टेयर	एयर	बर्गमीटर
2. कारीला (जोरी)			50	14/1	00	00	81
			72	20/1/2	00	00	25
			85	25	00	00	52
			91	17	00	00	67
3. राजपुर	23		8	8	00	00	30
				9	00	01	04
				21/1	00	00	70
			16	16	00	00	30
4. गुगाना	4		20	19	00	02	53
				20	00	01	44
				21	00	02	48
			24	15	00	00	80
5. बिरहेड़ा	5		6	4	00	02	34
				18	00	03	28
				23	00	02	10
			14	8/2/1	00	02	11
				18/1/1	00	00	46
			10	11/3	00	00	87
				12	00	00	63
			27	14	00	02	16
6. जराऊ	2			17	00	00	25
			16	9	00	00	59
7. मुशेदपुर	6		8	5	00	00	59
			20	4/2	00	00	66
			32	7/1	00	00	33
				11/1	00	06	48
				20/1	00	04	34
			6	32	00	07	56
				21/1	00	09	33
				21/2	00	00	52
			34	15/2	00	00	95
				24	00	03	06

[फा. सं. आर-31015/35/2004-ओ.आर.-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3576.— Whereas by notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 1910 dated the 25th May, 2005, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 28th May, 2005, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for transportation of petroleum products from Mundra in the State of Gujarat to Delhi through Mundra-Delhi Petroleum Product Pipeline by Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas copies of the said Gazette notification were made available to the public on the 6th July, 2005;

And whereas the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government ;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the said report and on being satisfied that the said land is required for laying the pipeline, has decided to acquire right of user therein;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule, appended to this notification, is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land for laying the pipeline shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of publication of this declaration, in Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, free from all encumbrances, subject to the conditions imposed vide this Ministry's consent letter no. R-31015/7/03 OR- II dated 25-11-2004.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : FARUK NAGAR		District : GURGAON		State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustil No.	Khasara / Killa No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre
1. FARIDPUR	15	8	1	00	00	55
2. KAROLA	14	27	21	00	01	41
		28	25/2	00	00	28
		43	5	00	00	98
			189	00	00	60
		50	14/1	00	00	81
		72	20/1/2	00	00	25
		85	25	00	00	52
		91	17	00	00	67

Tehsil : FARUK NAGAR		District : GURGAON			State : HARYANA		
Name of Village	Hadbast No.	Mustil No.	Khasara / Killa No.	Area			
				Hectare	Are	Square Metre	
3. RAJUPUR	23	8	8	00	00	30	
			9	00	01	04	
			21/1	00	00	70	
			16	00	00	30	
4. GUGANA	4	20	19	00	02	53	
			20	00	01	44	
			21	00	02	48	
			24	00	00	80	
5. BIRHERA	5	6	4	00	02	34	
			18	00	03	28	
			23	00	02	10	
			14	00	02	11	
			18/1/1	00	00	46	
			16	00	00	87	
			12	00	00	63	
			27	00	02	16	
6. JARAU	2	16	17	00	00	25	
			9	00	00	59	
7. MUSHIDPUR	6	8	5	00	00	59	
			20	00	00	66	
			32	00	00	33	
			11/1	00	06	48	
7. MUSHIDPUR (Contd...)	6	32	20/1	00	04	34	
			20/2	00	07	56	
			21/1	00	09	33	
			21/2	00	00	52	
			34	00	00	95	
			24	00	03	06	

[No. R-31015/35/2004-O.R.-III]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3577.—[केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और नैचुरल गैस पाइपलाइन (ग्राम में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का आ 632 तारीख 21 फरवरी, 2005 में, जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 26 फरवरी 2005 में पृष्ठ 1781 से पृष्ठ 1784 पर प्रकाशित की गई थी, निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:-

I. उक्त अधिसूचना के हिन्दी रूपान्तर की इस अनुसूची में:-

- (क) पृष्ठ संख्या 1781 पर स्तम्भ 2 में ग्राम "नीमोदा", के सामने स्तम्भ 3 के सर्वे नम्बर "1.36", के स्थान पर सर्वे नम्बर "1/36" रखा जाएगा ;
- (ख) पृष्ठ संख्या 1783 पर स्तम्भ 2 में ग्राम "खेड़ला (जारी)", के सामने स्तम्भ 3 के सर्वे नम्बर "205", में स्तम्भ 4 के क्षेत्रफल "0.036", के स्थान पर क्षेत्रफल "0.936", रखा जाएगा ;

II उक्त अधिसूचना के अंग्रेजी रूपान्तर की इस अनुसूची में:-

- (क) पृष्ठ संख्या 1783 पर स्तम्भ 2 में ग्राम "नीमोदा", के सामने स्तम्भ 3 के सर्वे नम्बर "1.36", के स्थान पर सर्वे नम्बर "1/36", रखा जाएगा ;
- (ख) पृष्ठ संख्या 1784 पर स्तम्भ 2 में ग्राम "खेड़ला (जारी)", के सामने स्तम्भ 3 के सर्वे नम्बर "324", के स्थान पर सर्वे नम्बर "342", रखा जाएगा ।

[फा. सं. आर-31015/87/2004-ओ.आर.-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3577.—[In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 632, dated the 21st February, 2005, published at pages 1781 to 1784 in Part II, section 3, sub-section(ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 26th February, 2005, namely:-

I. In the Schedule to Hindi version of the said notification:-

- (a) at page 1781, against village "Nimoda" in column 2, for the survey no. "1.36" in column 3, the survey no. "1/36" shall be substituted;
- (b) at page 1783, against village "Khedla(Contd)" in column 2, in survey no. "205" in column 3, for the area "0.036" in column 4, the area "0.936" shall be substituted;

II. In the Schedule, English version of the said notification:-

- (a) at page 1783, against village "Nimoda" in column 2, for survey no. "1.36" in column 3, the survey no. "1/36" shall be substituted;
- (b) at page 1784, against village "Khedla (Contd)", in column 2, for survey no. "324" in column 3, the survey no. "342" shall be substituted.

[No. R-31015/87/2004-O.R.-II]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3578.—**केन्द्रीय सरकार** को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिये इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, चेन्नई-तिरुच्चि -मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 12/30, एफ ब्लॉक, मार्क रेसिडेन्सी, वी.ओ.सी. रोड, कन्टोन्मेन्ट, तिरुच्चिरापल्ली -620 001 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : अम्बलूर		जिला : तिरुवल्लूर		राज्य : तमिलनाडु		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल			
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
नं. 28 अरियलूर	46	1	0	02	84	
	56	8ब	0	04	55	
	56	6	0	08	50	

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 1 कीलक्कोण्डियार	273	1अ	0	06	03
	265	1के	0	04	48
	265	2अ1	0	01	03
	265	4	0	01	60
	265	1ऐ	0	01	50
	265	1जे	0	01	50
	265	2अ2	0	01	58
	265	5	0	00	96
	265	2अ3	0	00	44

तालूका : तिरुवल्लूर	जिला : तिरुवल्लूर	राज्य : तमिलनाडु	1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 41 कोडुवली	233	2अ1	0	01	59			
	233	2अ2	0	11	04			
	233	3	0	12	08			
	255	1अ	0	01	18			
	255	1ब	0	01	42			
	255	2	0	01	74			
	256	1अ	0	01	06			
	256	1ब	0	00	41			
नं. 87 वेप्पंदूर	49	3	0	02	64			
	49	4	0	01	70			
	50	1	0	00	96			
	50	2अ	0	01	50			
	52	—	0	02	89			
	36	2अ	0	03	90			
	23	1	0	04	02			
नं. 90 आयत्तूर	266	1अ	0	05	57			
	266	1ब	0	05	40			
	266	2अ	0	00	95			
	266	2ब	0	04	76			
	266	3	0	05	80			
	264	1अ	0	03	47			
	264	1ब	0	03	85			
	116	—	0	08	64			
	236	1	0	13	34			
	236	2	0	01	91			
	236	3	0	00	51			
	270	1ब	0	00	40			

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 92 सैव्यायपेट्टै	133	2ब	0	16	09
	137	1	0	01	94
नं. 89 पेंडमालपट्टु	223	2	0	04	90
	221	1	0	06	75
नं. 136 तोडुकाडु	224	3	0	01	60
	224	4	0	03	22
	224	5	0	04	46
	224	10	0	11	70
	224	13	0	02	80
	224	14	0	03	60
	224	15	0	00	40
	224	16	0	00	88
	224	17	0	01	98
	224	18	0	05	42
	224	21	0	02	57
	253	2	0	23	58
	253	8	0	00	90
	252	13	0	04	38
	254	3	0	07	20
	254	2	0	01	14
	254	6	0	06	66
	254	7	0	03	78
	254	10	0	00	40
	254	15	0	02	00
	254	16	0	05	40
	254	18	0	04	20
	254	19	0	04	00
	261	1	0	02	00
	257	9	0	03	80
	257	8	0	04	00
	257	7	0	00	40
	257	6	0	05	40
	257	3	0	04	00
	257	4	0	01	80
	258	6	0	05	00
	258	1	0	06	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं० 136 तौडकाडु (जारी...)	248	15	0	01	00
	245	6	0	02	31
	245	7	0	01	00
	146	2	0	07	20
	146	3	0	08	20
	146	5	0	07	63
	147	2	0	10	20

[फा. सं. आर-25011/29/2004-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3578.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 12/30, F Block, Mark Residency, VOC Road, Contonment, Tiruchirappalli-620 001, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Ambathur		District : Tiruvallur		State : Tamil Nadu		
Name of the Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division no.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO.28 ARIYALUR	46	1	0	02	84	
	56	8B	0	04	55	
	56	6	0	08	50	
NO.1 KILKONDAIYUR	273	1A	0	06	03	
	265	1K	0	04	48	
	265	2A1	0	01	03	
	265	4	0	01	60	
	265	1I	0	01	50	
	265	1J	0	01	50	
	265	2A2	0	01	58	
	265	5	0	00	96	
	265	2A3	0	00	44	

Taluk : Tiruvallur		District : Tiruvallur		State : Tamil Nadu		
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO.41 KODUVALI	233	2A1	0	01	59	
	233	2A2	0	11	04	
	233	3	0	12	08	
	255	1A	0	01	18	
	255	1B	0	01	42	
	255	2	0	01	74	
	256	1A	0	01	06	
	256	1B	0	00	41	
NO.87 VEPPAMBATTU	49	3	0	02	64	
	49	4	0	01	70	
	50	1	0	00	96	
	50	2A	0	01	50	
	52	-	0	02	89	

1	2	3	4	5	6
	36	2A	0	03	90
	23	1	0	04	02
NO.90 AYATHUR	266	1A	0	05	57
	266	1B	0	05	40
	266	2A	0	00	95
	266	2B	0	04	76
	266	3	0	05	80
	264	1A	0	03	47
	264	1B	0	03	85
	116	-	0	08	64
	236	1	0	13	34
	236	2	0	01	91
	236	3	0	00	51
	270	1B	0	00	40
NO.92 SEVVAPETTAI	133	2B	0	16	09
	137	1	0	01	94
NO.89 PERUMALPATTU	223	2	0	04	90
	221	1	0	06	75
NO.136 THODUKADU	224	3	0	01	60
	224	4	0	03	22
	224	5	0	04	46
	224	10	0	11	70
	224	13	0	02	80
	224	14	0	03	60
	224	15	0	00	40
	224	16	0	00	88
	224	17	0	01	98
	224	18	0	05	42
	224	21	0	02	57
	253	2	0	23	58
	253	8	0	00	90
	252	13	0	04	38
	254	3	0	07	20
	254	2	0	01	14

1	2	3	4	5	6
	254	6	0	06	66
	254	7	0	03	78
	254	10	0	00	40
	254	15	0	02	00
	254	16	0	05	40
	254	18	0	04	20
	254	19	0	04	00
	261	1	0	02	00
	257	9	0	03	80
	257	8	0	04	00
	257	7	0	00	40
	257	6	0	05	40
	257	3	0	04	00
	257	4	0	01	80
	258	6	0	05	00
	258	1	0	06	00
	248	15	0	01	00
	245	6	0	02	31
	245	7	0	01	00
	146	2	0	07	20
	146	3	0	08	20
	146	5	0	07	63
	147	2	0	10	20

[F. No. R-25011/29/2004-O.R.-I]
S. K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3579.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से लिशॉन, मडुरई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिये इंटिग्रेट, गैंगल कम्पैगन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलु, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, चेन्नई-तिरुच्चि -मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक बांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 12/30, एफ ब्लॉक, मार्क रेसिडेन्सी, वी.ओ.सी. रोड, कन्देन्नेन्ट, तिरुच्चिपल्ली -620 001 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : श्रीपेरुम्पुदूर		जिला : कांजीपुरम		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 107 वलरपुरम	171	1	0	01	13
	172	4अ	0	00	40
	172	4ब	0	01	25
	161	1	0	02	86
	160	5	0	02	20
	159	1	0	02	80
	159	2	0	00	99
	278	13	0	02	65
	280	4	0	01	55
नं. 155 मांपाक्कम	88	6अ	0	02	51
	88	6ब	0	01	04
	90	6	0	02	30
	238	4	0	00	70

	1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 152 ऐच्चूर		692	12ब	0	00	40
		692	13	0	00	40
		693	7ब	0	03	07
नं. 214 ऐषिच्चूर		148	1ब	0	01	47
		147	1	0	11	02
		146	4	0	07	43

तालूका :	उत्तिरमेरूर	जिला :	कांजीपुरम	राज्य :	तमिलनाडु
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 103 तंडरै	5	4	0	01	17
	5	5अ	0	00	41
	5	5ब	0	00	60
	6	1	0	02	06
	7	2अ	0	02	20
	7	2ब	0	00	66
	10	2अ	0	02	12
	10	5अ	0	02	31
	11	1	0	01	42

तालूका :	मदुरांदगम	जिला :	कांजीपुरम	राज्य :	तमिलनाडु
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 38 विनायकनललूर	113		0	11	02

[फा. सं. आर-25011/29/2004-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S.O. 3579. — Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act.1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 12/30, F Block, Mark Residency, VOC Road, Contonment, Tiruchirappalli-620 001, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Sri Perumbudur		District : Kancheepuram		State : Tamil Nadu	
Name of the Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division no.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.107 VALARPURAM	171	1	0	01	13
	172	4A	0	00	40
	172	4B	0	01	25
	161	1	0	02	86
	160	5	0	02	20
	159	1	0	02	80
	159	2	0	00	99
	278	13	0	02	65
	280	4	0	01	55
NO.155 MAMBAKKAM	88	6A	0	02	51
	88	6B	0	01	04
	90	6	0	02	30
	238	4	0	00	70
NO.152 ECHOOR	692	12B	0	00	40
	692	13	0	00	40
	693	7B	0	03	07

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.214 EZHICHOOR	148	1B	0	01	47
	147	1	0	11	02
	146	4	0	07	42

Taluk : Uthiramerur		District : Kancheepuram		State : Tamil Nadu	
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.103 THANDARAI	5	4	0	01	17
	5	5A	0	00	41
	5	5B	0	00	60
	6	1	0	02	06
	7	2A	0	02	20
	7	2B	0	00	66
	10	2A	0	02	12
	10	5A	0	02	31
	11	1	0	01	42

Taluk : Madurantakam		District : Kancheepuram		State : Tamil Nadu	
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.38 VINAYAGANALLUR	113	-	0	11	02

[F. No. R-25011/29/2004-O.R.]
S. K. CHITKARA, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. भा. 3580.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुचि, मदुराई और शंकरा तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिये इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, चेन्नई-तिरुचि -मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 12/30, एफ ब्लॉक, मार्क रेसिडेन्सी, वी.ओ.सी. रोड, कन्टेन्मेन्ट, तिरुचिरापल्ली -620 001 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : कुन्नम		जिला : पेरम्बलूर		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं . 27.तिरुमांदुरै	329	4	0	00	61
	339	4अ	0	12	00
	339	4ब	0	01	72
	339	4क	0	01	00
	339	4ड	0	00	40

[फा. सं. आर-25011/29/2004-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अधर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 355a.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 12/30, F Block, Mark Residency, VOC Road, Contonment, Tiruchirappalli-620 001, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE						
Taluk : Kunnarn		District : Perambalur		State : Tamil Nadu		
Name of the Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division no.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO.27 TIRUMANDURAI	329	4	0	00	61	
	339	4A	0	12	00	
	339	4B	0	01	72	
	339	4C	0	01	00	
	339	4D	0	00	40	

[F. No. R-25011/29/2004-O.R.-I]
S. K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3581.—~~केन्द्रीय~~ सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिये इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रांतीय साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, चेन्नई-तिरुच्चि -मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 12/30, एफ ब्लॉक, मार्क रेसिडेन्सी, वी.ओ.सी. रोड, कन्ट्रेन्नेन्ट, तिरुच्चिरापल्ली -620 001 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : लाल्कुडि		जिला : तिरुच्चिराप्पल्ली		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गॉव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	बर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 30. मरुधूर	41	4	0	00	73
	43	3अ	0	02	44
	43	3ब	0	02	17
	43	3क	0	01	80
	44	2क	0	03	36
	44	5	0	05	60
	67	1ब	0	00	92
	64	1ब	0	00	81

तालूका : तिरुच्चिराप्पल्ली		जिला : तिरुच्चिराप्पल्ली		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 60. कूत्तप्पार	6 23अ	1 0ब	0	02	63
	6 03अ	2	0	02	19
	6 0ब	2	0	00	50

[फा. सं. आर-25011/29/2004-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

S. O. 3581.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act.1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 12/30, F Block, Mark Residency, VOC Road, Contonment, Tiruchirappalli-620 001, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : LALGUDI		District : TIRUCHIRAPALLI		State : TAMILNADU		
Name of the Village		Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO.30 MARUDUR	41	4	0	00	73	
	43	3A	0	02	44	
	43	3B	0	02	17	
	43	3C	0	01	80	
	44	2C	0	03	36	
	44	5	0	05	60	
	67	1B	0	00	92	
	64	1B	0	00	81	
Taluk : TIRUCHIRAPALLI		District : TIRUCHIRAPALLI		State : TAMILNADU		
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO.60 KUTTAPPAR	62A	10B	0	02	63	
	60A	2	0	02	19	
	60B	2	0	00	50	

[F. No. R-25011/29/2004-O.R.-I]
S. K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3582.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिये इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ; और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है ; अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ; उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, चेन्नई-तिरुच्चि -मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 12/30, एफ ब्लॉक, मार्क रेसिडेन्सी, वी.ओ.सी. रोड, कन्टोन्मेन्ट, तिरुचिरापल्ली -620 001 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : मेलूर		जिला : मदुरै		राज्य : तमिलनाडु		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल			
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
नं . 47 सेक्किप्पटिट	83	11	0	00	40	
	83	16	0	02	40	
	80	1ब1	0	00	50	
	80	1अ	0	02	00	
	82	9ब	0	04	80	
	82	10अ	0	01	48	
	76	-	0	01	05	
	71	7अ	0	00	50	

तालूका : मेयूर	जिला : मदुरै		राज्य : तमिलनाडु		
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 47. मेयूरपट्टि	71	6अ1	0	02	10
	71	4ब	0	01	20
	71	14	0	01	40
	71	12	0	00	82
नं. 46 कंबूर	136	1एन	0	02	12
	136	1अ इ	0	01	22
	136	1अ क	0	01	50
	136	1अ जि	0	02	50
	139	1अ28	0	00	40
	139	4अ	0	04	55
	136	5अ	0	01	60
	136	5क	0	01	32
	136	5ड	0	00	50
नं. 48 केसमपट्टी	631	2	0	04	75
	632	2	0	26	56
	633	3	0	04	53

तालूका : मदुरै (सबुथ)	जिला : मदुरै		राज्य : तमिलनाडु		
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 12 संपक्कुडी	53	7ब	0	01	30
	53	7अ	0	00	80
	53	5	0	00	70
	53	6अ	0	03	30
	51	1अ	0	01	30
	51	2ब	0	01	20

तालूका : तिरुमंडलगलम	जिला : मदुरै		राज्य : तमिलनाडु		
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 11 धर्मत्तुप्पट्टि	19	1ऐ	0	00	60
	19	1क3	0	02	00
	19	1क5	0	02	00

[फा. सं. आर-25011/29/2004-जी.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2005

s. o. 3582.— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 12/30, F Block, Mark Residency, VOC Road, Contonment, Tiruchirappalli-620 001, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE

Taluk :MELUR		District : MADURAI		State : TAMILNADU		
	Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
				Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
	1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.47.SEKKIPATTI		83	11	0	00	40
		83	16	0	02	40
		80	1B1	0	00	50
		80	1A	0	02	00
		82	9B	0	04	80
		82	10A	0	01	48
		76	-	0	01	05
		71	7A	0	00	50
		71	6A1	0	02	10
		71	4B	0	01	20

Taluk : MELUR	District : MADURAI			State : TAMILNADU	
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 47. SEKKIPATTI	71	14	0	01	40
	71	12	0	00	82
NO. 46. KAMBUR	136	1N	0	02	12
	136	1AE	0	01	22
	136	1AC	0	01	50
	136	1AG	0	02	50
	139	1A28	0	00	40
	139	4A	0	04	55
	136	5A	0	01	60
	136	5C	0	01	32
	136	5D	0	00	50
NO. 48. KESAMPATTI	631	2	0	04	75
	632	2	0	26	56
	633	3	0	04	53

Taluk : MADURAI SOUTH	District : MADURAI			State : TAMILNADU	
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 12. SAMBAKUDI	53	7B	0	01	30
	53	7A	0	00	80
	53	5	0	00	70
	53	6A	0	03	30
	51	1A	0	01	30
	51	2B	0	01	20

Taluk : THIRUMANGALAM	District : MADURAI			State : TAMILNADU	
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 11. OHARMATHUPATTI	19	1I	0	00	60
	19	1C3	0	02	00
	19	1C5	0	02	00

[F. No. R-25011/29/2004-O.R.-I]
S. K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3583.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में, भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का.आ. 1925 तारीख 27 जुलाई, 2004 का आशोधन करते हुए, मांगल्या (इन्दौर) से पियाला/बिजवासन तक भारत पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (बी.पी.सी.एल.) की मुम्बई-मांगल्या पाइपलाइन विस्तार परियोजना के लिए, बी.पी.सी.एल. में प्रतिनियुक्ति पर श्री अरविन्द खरे, महाप्रबंधक, जिला व्यापार व उद्योग केन्द्र, खरगौन, (मध्य प्रदेश) को मध्य प्रदेश राज्य के राज्य क्षेत्र के भीतर, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का निर्वहन करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फा. सं. आर-31015/8/2004-ओ.आर.-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th October, 2005

S. O. 3583.—In modification of notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O. 1925 dated the 27th July, 2004, and in pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Arvind Khare, GM, District Trade & Industry Centre, Khargon (Madhya Pradesh), on deputation to Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL), to perform the functions of competent authority for BPCL's Mumbai-Manglya Pipeline Extension Project from Manglya (Indore) to Piyala / Bijwasan, under the said Act, within the territory of State of Madhya Pradesh.

[No. R-31015/8/2004-O.R.-II]
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 2005

शुद्धिपत्र

का. आ. 3584.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 430, तारीख 01 फरवरी, 2005 में, जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 5 फरवरी 2005, में पृष्ठ 1142 पर प्रकाशित की गई थी, निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:-

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित अनुसूची रखी जाय:-

अनुसूची

तहसील: उनियारा		जिला: टोंक	राज्य: राजस्थान
क्र.	ग्राम का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
1	करवाडीया खास	191	0.1728
		188	1.0944
2	मोहम्मदपुरा	186	1.8216
		184	0.0288
		187	0.0360

[फा. सं. आर-31015/80/2004-ओ.आर.-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th October, 2005

Amendment

S. O. 3584.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, number S.O. 430 dated the 1st February, 2005, published at page 1142 in Part II, section 3, sub-section(ii), of the Gazette of India, dated the 5th February, 2005, namely:-

The Schedule to the said notification, may be substituted with the following:-

SCHEDULE

TEHSIL: UNIYARA		DISTRICT: TONK		STATE: RAJASTHAN	
S.No.	NAME OF VILLAGE	SURVEY NO.	AREA IN HECTARE		
1.	2.	3.	4.		
1.	KARWADIA KHAS	191	0.1728		
		188	1.0944		
2.	MOHAMMADPURA	186	1.8216		
		184	0.0288		
		187	0.0360		

[No. R-31015/80/2004-O.R.-II]

HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3584.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की मेसर्स गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड की संप्रवर्तक कंपनी मेसर्स रिक्वाएंस इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड है, के गोवा में उत्तरी / दक्षिणी अपतट में खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्रप्रदेश में खानों से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में, ठाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में श्री. एस.डी.मिसे, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जीटीआयसीएल पाईप लाईन परियोजना, प्लॉट नं. एस 13, एच 13 से 15 तक, चौथा माला, भारत गैस गोडाऊन के सामने, लाल चौकी, आधारवाडी रोड, कल्याण (प) जिला ठाणे, 421 301, महाराष्ट्र/ राज्य, को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/ तहसील/ तालुका	जिल्हा : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र
गांव का नाम	सर्वे / हिस्सा नंबर	आर. ओ. यु. अर्जित करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल
		हेक्टर एर सि-एर
1	2	3 4 5
1) मुसारेणे	542*	00 00 10
	253*	00 00 10
	251*	00 00 10
	447**	00 01 77
	438**	00 02 96
	385**	00 28 96
	256**	00 05 08
	250**	00 01 93
	223**	00 04 43
	219**	00 05 87
	213**	00 03 99
	212**	00 02 93
2) विजयगड	11/2A*	00 03 31
	10/7A*	00 14 50
	10/7B*	00 14 51
	10/1/1*	00 00 55
3) डोंगले	5/6A*	00 02 64
	5/1/1/2A*	00 17 17
मंडल/ तहसील/ तालुका	जिल्हा : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र
1) कोंडगांव	62*	00 03 80
2) म्हसरोली	107**	00 39 60

* नई अधिसूचना.

* क.आ. 3039, दिनांक : 23/11/2004, द्वारा पी.एच.डी. अक्ट, 1962 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत सूचित किये गये सर्वे नंबर

[फा. सं. एल-14014/41/04-जी.पी.

एस. बी. मंडल, अवर सचि

New Delhi, the 7th October, 2005

S. O. 3585.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from exploration blocks in the Northern / Southern Offshore of Goa and structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to the various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And, whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipelines are proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification, as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of section (3) of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri. S. D. Bhise, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited, Plot No.S-13, H-13 to 15, 4th floor, Opp. Bharat Gas Godown, Adharwadi Road, Lal Chowki. Kalyan (W) Kalyan-421 301.

Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Wada		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
Village	Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for gas			
		Hectare	Acre	C-Acre	
1	2	3	4	5	
1) Musame	542*	00	00	10	
	253*	00	00	10	
	251*	00	00	10	
	447**	00	01	77	
	438**	00	02	96	
	385**	00	28	96	
	256**	00	05	08	
	250**	00	01	83	
	223**	00	04	43	
	219**	00	05	87	
	213**	00	03	99	
	212**	00	02	93	

	2	3	4	5
2) Vajragad	11/2A*	00	03	31
	10/7A*	00	14	50
	10/7B*	00	14	51
	10/1/1*	00	00	55
3) Dongaste	5/6A*	00	02	64
	5/1A+2A*	00	17	17
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Vikramgad		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra
1) Kondgaon	62*	00	03	80
2) Mhasroli	107**	00	39	80

* Fresh Notification

** Survey Nos. Notified vide S.O. 3039 dated 23/11/2004, u/s 3(1) of PMP Act, 1962 Additional areas.

[F. No. L-14014/41/04-G.P.]
S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3586.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की मेसर्स गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड की संप्रवर्तक कंपनी मेसर्स रिलाएंस इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड है, के गोवा में उत्तरी / दक्षिणी अपट्ट (ऑफ़शोर) में खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्रप्रदेश में संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में, ठाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलेियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा (3) की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में तथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिये उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री. एस.डी.मिसे, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जीटीआयसीएल पाईप लाईन परियोजना, प्लॉट नं. एस 13, एच 13 से 15 तक, चौथा माला, भारत गैस गोडाऊन के सामने, सल चौकी, आधारवाडी रोड, कल्याण (प) जिला ठाणे, 421 301, महाराष्ट्र/राज्य, को लिखित रूप में आशेष भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/ तहसील/ तालुका कल्याण		जिल्हा : ठाणे		राज्य : महाराष्ट्र		
गांव का नाम	सर्वे / हिस्सा नंबर	आर. ओ. यु. अर्जित करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल				
		हेक्टर	एर	सि-एर		
1	2	3	4	5		
1) वाघोली	93	00	27	65		
2) अन्वर	29/2	00	04	40		
	29/3	00	06	50		
	29/4	00	19	80		

1	2	3	4	5
2) तालुका (तालासरी...)	49/2	00	00	10
	49/3	00	16	00
	49/4	00	33	00
	49/5	00	41	20
	49/7	00	01	20
3) गुल्मी	35	00	18	25
मंडल/ तालुका/ तालुका तालासरी	जिल्हा : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र		
1) तालासरी	90/2	00	03	45
अधिकृत नं. २				

[फा. सं. एल-14014/42/04-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मंडल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th October, 2005

S. O. 3586.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from exploration blocks in the Northern / Southern Offshore of Goa and structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to the various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And, whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipelines are proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification, as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of section (3) of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri. S. D. Bhise, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited, Plot No.S-13, H-13 to 15, 4th floor, Opp. Bharat Gas Godown, Adharwadi Road, Lal Chowki. Kalyan (W) Kalyan-421 301.

Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Kalyan		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
	Village	Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU		
			Hectare	Are	C-Are
	1	2	3	4	5
1) Vaholi		93	00	27	65
2) Ankhar		29/2	00	04	40
		29/3	00	06	50
		29/4	00	19	80
		49/2	00	00	10
		49/3	00	16	00
		49/4	00	33	00
		49/6	00	41	20
		49/7	00	01	20
3) Guravali		35	00	18	25
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Talasari		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
1) Talasari		90/2	00	03	45

All above Survey Nos.

[F. No. L-14014/42/04-G.P.]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3587.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की मेसर्स गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड की संप्रवर्तक कंपनी मेसर्स रिलाएंस इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड है, के गोवा में उत्तरी / दक्षिणी अपतट (ऑफशोर) में खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्रप्रदेश में संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में, ठाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस ट्रान्सपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा (3) की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिये उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री. एस.डी.मिसे, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जीटीआयसीएल पाइप लाइन परियोजना, प्लॉट नं. एस 13, एच 13 से 15 तक, चौथा माला, भारत गैस गोडाऊन के सामने, लाल चौकी, आधारवाडी रोड, कल्याण (प) जिला ठाणे, 421 301, महाराष्ट्र/ राज्य, को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/ तहसील/ तालुका शिबंदी	जिल्ला : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र		
गांव का नाम	सर्वे / हिस्सा नंबर	अर. ओ. यु. अधीत करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल		
		हेक्टर	एर	चि-कर
1	2	3	4	5
2) किरवली	103*	00	13	41

* र्द्ध अधिसूचना.

[फा. सं. एल-14014/43/04-बी.पी.]

एस. बी. मंडल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th October, 2005

S. O. 3587.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from exploration blocks in the Northern / Southern Offshore of Goa and structures in Andhra Pradesh of M/s Reliance Industries Limited, the promoter company of M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited to the various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this Notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri. S. D. Bhise, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited, Pipeline Project, Plot No.S-13, H-13 to 15, 4th floor, Opp. Bharat Gas Godown, Adharwadi Road, Lal Chowki. Kalyan (W) Kalyan- 421 301. Maharashtra State.

Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Bhiwandi			District: Thane		State: Maharashtra	
Village		Survey/ Sub-division No.	Area to be acquired for ROU			
			Hectare	Acre	C-Acre	
1	2	3	4	5		
1) Kiravali	103*	00	13	41		

* Fresh Notification

[F. No. L-14014/43/04-G.P.]

S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 अक्टूबर, 2005

का. आ. 3588. — केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिये गोवा में उत्तरी / दक्षिणी अक्षाट में खोज ब्लॉकों और आन्ध्रप्रदेश में संरचनाओं से महाराष्ट्र राज्य में, ठाणे जिले के विभिन्न उपमोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कंपनी लिमिटेड द्वारा एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है की उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोसियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा (3) की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में क्या प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इसीसे दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिये उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री. एस.डी.भित्ते, सख्त प्राधिकारी, जीटीआयसीएल पाईप लाईन परियोजना, प्लॉट नं. एस 13, एच 13 से 15 तक, चौथा माला, भारत गैस गोडाऊन के सामने, लाल चौकी, आधारवाडी रोड, कल्याण (प) जिला ठाणे, 421 301, को लिखित रूप में आवेदन केज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/ तहसील/ तालुका स्थान	जिला : ठाणे	राज्य : महाराष्ट्र	आर. ओ. यु. अर्जित करने के लिये क्षेत्रफल		
गांव का नाम	सर्वे / हिस्सा नंबर		हेक्टर	एर	सि-एर
1	2		3	4	5
	5/1A+2A*		00	17	17
1) विरवळे	38/1*		00	08	55
	36/3*		00	57	05
2) विंघले	97*		01	11	35
	32/12*		00	45	05
	32/13*		00	28	45

[फा. सं. एल-14014/44/04-जी.पी.]

एस. बी. मंडल, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th October, 2005

S. O. 3598.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of the natural gas from exploration blocks in the Northern / Southern Offshore of Goa and structures in Andhra Pradesh state, to the various consumers of District Thane in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid by M/s Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of the user therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri. S. D. Bhise, Competent Authority, Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited, Pipeline Project, Plot No.S-13, H-13 to 15, 4th floor, Opp. Bharat Gas Godown, Adharwadi Road, Lal Chowki. Kalyan (W) Kalyan-421 301.

Schedule

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluka: Dahamli		District: Thane		State : Maharashtra	
Village		Survey/ Sub-division No.		Area to be acquired for ROU	
			Hectare	Acre	C-Acre
1	2	3	4	5	
1) Vivalvedhe	38/1*	00	08	55	
	38/3*	00	57	05	
2) Chinchale	97*	01	11	35	
	32/12*	00	45	05	
	32/13*	00	28	45	

* Fresh Notification

[F. No. L-14014/44/04-G.P.]
S. B. MANDAL, Under Secy.

कोयला मंत्रालय

शुद्धि - पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3589.— भारत के राजपत्र तारीख 19 मार्च, 2005 के भाग II, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) में पृष्ठ क्रमांक 2780 से 2782 तक में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार, कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का0आ0 1028 तारीख 11 मार्च 2005 में .-

पृष्ठ क्रमांक 2781 पर, प्रथम पंक्ति में -

- (i) 'परिक्षेप' के स्थान पर 'परिक्षेत्र' पढ़ें ।
- (ii) ग्राम रजखड़ में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्यांक में '200 (भाग)' के बाद एवं '203(भाग)' के पूर्व '201(भाग)' जोड़ कर पढ़ें ।

पृष्ठ क्रमांक 2782 पर, सीमा वर्णन में -

- (i) छद्मी पंक्ति में 'की' के पश्चात् एवं 'सीमा' के पूर्व 'उभम' के स्थान पर 'उभय' पढ़ें ।
- (ii) रेखा ख-ग के अंतर्गत तीसरी पंक्ति में 'उभम' के स्थान पर 'उभय' पढ़ें ।
- (iii) रेखा छ-ज के अंतर्गत पांचवी पंक्ति में 'जाती' के बाद एवं 'और' के पहले 'है' जोड़कर पढ़ें ।

[फा. सं. आर-43015/1/2003-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

एम. शहाबुद्दीन, अवर सचिव

Ministry of Coal
Corrigendum

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S. O. 3589.— In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 1028, dated 11th March, 2005 and published at pages No. 2782 to 2784 of the Gazette of India, Part -II, section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 19th March, 2005,

(a) at page 2783.-

- (i) in line 28, for "7A (i)" read "7(1)"
- (ii) in line 33, after "60 (P)" and before "62 (P)" read "61(P)".

(b) at page 2784.-

- (i) in line 4, for "254 (P)" read "354 (P)" and for "255" read "355".
- (ii) In line 13, for "64.65 acres" read "64.50 acres".
- (iii) In line 45, after "178" and before "and" read "177".

[No. 43015/1/2003-PRIW]
M. SHAHABUDEEN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3590.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (i) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग-II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 18 दिसम्बर, 2004 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 3194, तारीख 14 दिसम्बर, 2004 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूचि में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में जिसका माप 428.00 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 1057.58 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूचि में वर्णित उक्त भूमि के भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूचि में यथावर्णित 397.25 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 981.60 एकड़ (लगभग) माप वाली भूमि और ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के सभी अधिकारों का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है -

टिप्पण 1 :- इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. सी-1 (ई) III/ जेजेएनआर/731-0305, तारीख 31 मार्च, 2005 का निरीक्षण, कलेक्टर यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउसस्ट्रीट, कोलकाता (पिन 700001) के कार्यालय में या वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, (राजस्व विभाग) कोल इस्टेट, सिविल लाईन्स, नागपुर - 440 001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है ।

टिप्पण 2 :- कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध है :-

अर्जन की बाबत आपत्तियां :-

- “ 8. (1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिनों के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा ।

स्पष्टीकरण -इस धारा के अर्थान्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए । ,

- (2) उपधारा (i) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है, वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (i) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।
- (3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता, यदि भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते हैं।”

टिप्पण 3 :- केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता-700 001 को भारत के राजपत्र, भाग-II, खंड 3, उपखण्ड (ii), तारीख 11 जून, 1983 में प्रकाशित अधिसूचना संख्याक का. आ. 2519, तारीख 27 मई, 1983 द्वारा अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

अनुसूची भाग (क)

कोलार-पिपरी डीप विस्तारित खंड

वनी उत्तरी क्षेत्र, जिला यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं. सी -1(ई)III/जेजेएनआर/731-0305, तारीख 31 मार्च, 2005)

सभी अधिकार:

क्रम सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्किल संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1	गोवरी	31	वनी	यवतमाल	66.77	भाग
2	कोलेरा	32	वनी	यवतमाल	143.57	भाग
3	पिपरी	32	वनी	यवतमाल	23.86	भाग
4	ब्राम्हनी	32	वनी	यवतमाल	5.57	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र:- 239.77 हेक्टर (लगभग)

या

592.47 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम गोवरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या:

67, 69, 70, 71/1- 71/2, 72, 73, 92/1- 92/2, 93/1- 93/2, 94/1- 94/2, 96, 97, 102/1- 102/2- 102/3, 103, 104/1- 104/2, 105/1- 105/2, 106, 110, 111, 133/1- 133/2, 134, 135, 136, 137.

ग्राम कोलेरा में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28/1- 28/2, 29/1- 29/2, 30/1- 30/2, 31/1- 31/2- 31/3- 31/4- 31/5, 32, 33, 34/1- 34/2, 35, 36, 37/1- 37/2- 37/3, 38, 39, 40, 41,

42/1- 42/2, 43/1- 43/2, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 161, 162, 176, 177/1- 177/2, 178/1- 178/2, 179/1- 179/2, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192/1- 192/2, 193, 194, 195/1- 195/2, 196, 197, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, आबादी, सड़क (भाग).

ग्राम पिंपरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या:

31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 51, 52/1- 52/2- 52/3, 53, 54, सड़क (भाग).

ग्राम ब्राम्हनी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या:

70/- 70/2, 71.

सीमा वर्णन:

क - ख: रेखा बिन्दु 'क' से आरम्भ होती है और प्लॉट संख्या 137, 136, 102/1- 102/2- 102/3, 97, 96, 94/1- 94/2, 67, 70, 69 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम गोवरी से होकर गुजरती है, फिर प्लॉट संख्या 196, 197, 193, 222, 221, 220, 219, 218, आबादी 1, 2, 10, 25, 24, 33, की बाह्य सीमा के साथ जाती है फिर ग्राम गोवरी और कोलेरा की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है फिर ग्राम कोलेरा और पिंपरी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा और प्लॉट संख्या 33, 34/1- 34/2, 35, 37/1- 37/2- 37/3, 39 के साथ-साथ गुजरती है फिर ग्राम प्लॉट संख्या 31, 32, 33, 34 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पिंपरी से होकर आगे बढ़ती हुई सड़क पार करती है और प्लॉट संख्या 54 की बाह्य सीमा से जाती हुई ग्राम पिंपरी और अहेरी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा से होती हुई प्लॉट संख्यांक 54, 53, 52/1- 52/2- 52/3, 51 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।

ख - ग: रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 51, 40 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पिंपरी से होकर गुजरती है ग्राम पिंपरी और कोलेरा की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा को पार करती है और ग्राम कोलेरा के प्लॉट संख्यांक 62, 61 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है। ग - घ: रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 61, 60, 54 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम कोलेरा से होकर गुजरती है, सड़क और प्लॉट संख्यांक 54, 42/1- 42/2, 43/1- 43/2, 31/1- 31/2- 31/3- 31/4- 31/5, 30/1- 30/2 की बाह्य सीमा को, पार करती है, सड़क तथा सड़क की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ, आबादी और प्लॉट संख्यांक 161, 162, 189, 188, 186, 182, 181, 179/1- 179/2, 176 को पार करती है, फिर ग्राम कोलेरा और ब्राम्हनी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा और प्लॉट संख्यांक 71, 70/1- 70/2 की बाह्य सीमा को पार करती है, और ग्राम ब्राम्हनी और गोवरी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा को पार करती है, और प्लॉट संख्यांक 72, 73, 92/1- 92/2, 106, 110, 111, 133/1- 133/2 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।

घ - क: रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 133/1- 133/2, 137 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम गोवरी से होकर गुजरती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

अनुसूची भाग (ख)
कोलार-पिंपरी डीप विस्तारित खंड
वनी उत्तरी क्षेत्र, जिला यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं. सी -1(ई)III/जेजेएनआर/731-0305 तारीख 31 मार्च, 2005)

सभी अधिकार:

क्रम सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्किल संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1	अहेरी	32	वनी	यवतमाल	43.52	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र 43.52 हेक्टर (लगभग)

या

107.53 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम अहेरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या

230/1ए- 230/1बी- 230/2- 230/3, 231/1- 231/2, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288/1ए- 288/1बी- 288/2ए- 288/2बी- 288/3ए- 288/3बी, 297/1- 297/2- 297/3- 297/4, 298/1- 298/2- 298/3- 298/4, 299, 300/1- 300/2, सड़क (भाग) ।

सीमा वर्णन:-

ड. - च:

रेखा बिन्दु 'ड' से आरंभ होती है और वर्धा नदी के दक्षिण तट के साथ-साथ ग्राम अहेरी और प्लॉट संख्या 297/1- 297/2- 297/3- 297/4, 299, 300/1- 300/2 की बाह्य सीमा से होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'च' पर मिलती है ।

च - छ:

रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 300/1- 300/2, 288/1ए- 288/1बी- 288/2ए- 288/2बी- 288/3ए- 288/3बी, की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम अहेरी से होकर गुजरती है सड़क पार करती है और फिर प्लॉट संख्या 285, 284, 283, 282, 281, 236, 235, 233, 232, 231/1- 231/2, 230/1ए- 230/1बी- 230/2- 230/3 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'छ' पर मिलती है ।

छ - ज:

रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 230/1ए- 230/1बी- 230/2- 230/3 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम अहेरी से होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'ज' पर मिलती है ।

ज - ड.:

रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 230/1ए- 230/1बी- 230/2- 230/3, 231/1- 231/2, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 280, 279 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम अहेरी से होकर गुजरती है, सड़क पार करती है और प्लॉट संख्या 278, 277, 288/1ए- 288/1बी- 288/2ए- 288/2बी- 288/3ए- 288/3बी, 298/1- 298/2- 298/3- 298/4, 297/1- 297/2- 297/3- 297/4 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'ड.' पर मिलती है ।

अनुसूची भाग 'ग'
कोलार-चिपरी डीप विस्तारित खंड
वनी उत्तरी क्षेत्र, जिला यवतमाल (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं.सी -1(ई)III/जेजेएनआर/731-0305 तारीख 31 मार्च, 2005)

सभी अधिकार:

क्रम सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्किल संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1	अहेरी	32	वनी	यवतमाल	55.48	भाग
2	बोरगांव	33	वनी	यवतमाल	58.48	

कुल क्षेत्र 113.96 हेक्टर (लगभग)

या

281.60 एकड़ (लगभग)

कुल योग:-

अनुसूची भाग 'क' + अनुसूची भाग 'ख' + अनुसूची भाग 'ग' = सभी अधिकार			
239.77	+	43.52	+ 113.96 = 397.25 हेक्टर (लगभग)
592.47	+	107.53	+ 281.60 = 981.60 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम अहेरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या:-

1 (भाग), 2 (भाग), 3, 4 (भाग), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9/1- 9/2- 9/3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15/1- 15/2, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 (भाग), 30, 31 (भाग), 32 (भाग), 33, 34, 35 (भाग), 36 (भाग), 48/1(भाग), 48/1ए, 48/2(भाग), 49, 50 (भाग), 51/2- 51/3- 51/4(भाग), 60/1(भाग), सडक (भाग).

ग्राम बोरगांव में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या:-

79, 94/ए- 94/बी- 94/सी, 98, 99, 100, 101/1- 101/2, 102, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139/2, 140/2ए, 143/2, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151/1- 151/1ए- 151/2, 153, 154, 155/1- 155/2, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160/1- 160/2, 161, 162/1- 162/2, 163, 168, 169.

सीमा वर्णन:-

च - झ: रेखा बिन्दु 'च' से आरंभ होती है और वर्धा नदी के दक्षिण तट के साथ-साथ ग्राम अहेरी से और प्लॉट संख्यांक 2, 3, 7, 8, 9/1- 9/2- 9/3, 11, 12, की बाह्य सीमा से होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'झ' पर मिलती है।

झ - ज: रेखा ग्राम अहेरी और बोरगांव की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा और प्लॉट संख्या 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 169, 168, 163, 161, 158, 155/1- 155/2, 94/ए- 94/बी- 94/सी, 98, 99, 100, 79 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम बोरगांव से होकर आगे बढ़ती है और बिन्दु 'ज' पर मिलती है।

ज - ट: रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 79, 102, 101/1- 101/2, 136, 135, 134 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम बोरगांव से होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'ट' पर मिलती है।

ट - च:

रेखा प्लॉट संख्या 134, 140/2ए, 139/2, 143/2, 152/2 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम बोरगांव से होकर गुजरती है, ग्राम बोरगांव और अहेरी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा को पार करती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 60/1(भाग), 50 (भाग), 51/2- 51/3- 51/4(भाग), 48/1(भाग)- 48/1ए- 48/2(भाग), 31 (भाग), 29 (भाग), 32 (भाग), 35 (भाग), 36 (भाग) में से गुजरती हुई आगे बढ़ती है, सड़क पार करती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 4 (भाग), 1 (भाग), 2 (भाग) में से आगे बढ़ती है, और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'च' पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. आर-43015/15/2004-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

एम. शहाबुद्दीन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 29th September, 2005

S. O. 3590.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 3194 dated the 14th December, 2004 published in the Gazette of India, Part – II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 18th December, 2004 under Sub-Section (1) of Section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 428.00 hectares (approximately) or 1057.58 acres (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said lands described in the schedules appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the lands measuring 397.25 hectares (approximately) or 981.60 acres (approximately) and All Rights in or over such lands as described in the Schedule appended hereto.

Note 1 The plan bearing No. C-1 (E)III/JJNR/731-0305 dated the 31st March, 2005 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Yavatmal (Maharashtra) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata (Pin 700 001) or in the office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Department), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur – 440 001 (Maharashtra).

Note 2 Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) which provides as follows :-

Objections to acquisition :

“8. (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation: - It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

- (2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further enquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of Section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.
- (3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act."

Note 3: - The Coal Controller, 1, Council house Street, Kolkata – 700 001, has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act, vide notification number S.O. 2519 dated the 27th May, 1983, published in Part – II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 11th June, 1983.

Schedule (Part – 'A')

Kolar-Pimpri Deep Extension Block Wani North Area, District Yavatmal, (Maharashtra)

All Rights (Plan No. C-1(E)III/JJNR/731-0305 dated the 31st March, 2005).

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Gowari	31	Wani	Yavatmal	66.77	Part
2	Kolera	32	Wani	Yavatmal	143.57	Part
3	Pimpri	32	Wani	Yavatmal	23.86	Part
4	Bramhni	32	Wani	Yavatmal	5.57	Part

Total area 239.77hectares (approximately)
or 592.47 acres (approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Gowari :

67, 69, 70, 71/1- 71/2, 72, 73, 92/1- 92/2, 93/1- 93/2, 94/1- 94/2, 96, 97, 102/1- 102/2- 102/3, 103, 104/1- 104/2, 105/1- 105/2, 106, 110, 111, 133/1- 133/2, 134, 135, 136, 137.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Kolera :

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28/1- 28/2, 29/1- 29/2, 30/1- 30/2, 31/1- 31/2- 31/3- 31/4- 31/5, 32, 33, 34/1- 34/2, 35, 36, 37/1- 37/2- 37/3, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42/1- 42/2, 43/1- 43/2, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 161, 162, 176, 177/1- 177/2, 178/1- 178/2, 179/1- 179/2, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192/1- 192/2, 193, 194, 195/1- 195/2, 196, 197, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, Abadi, Road (Part).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Pimpri :

31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 51, 52/1- 52/2- 52/3, 53, 54, Road (Part).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Bramhni :

70/1- 70/2, 71.

Boundary description :

- A – B :** Line starts from point 'A' and passes through village Gowari along the outer boundary of plot numbers 137, 136, 102/1- 102/2- 102/3, 97, 96, 94/1- 94/2, 67, 70, 69, then proceeds through common village boundary of villages Gowari and Kolera along the outer boundary of plot numbers 196, 197, 193, 222, 221, 220, 219, 218, Abadi, 1, 2, 10, 25, 24, 33 then passes along the common village boundary of villages Kolera and Pimpri and outer boundary of plot numbers 33, 34/1- 34/2, 35, 37/1- 37/2- 37/3, 39, then proceed through village Pimpri along the outer boundary of plot numbers 31, 32, 33, 34, crosses road and outer boundary of plot number 54 and common village boundary of villages Pimpri and Aheri and the outer boundary of plot numbers 54, 53, 52/1- 52/2- 52/3, 51 and meets at point 'B'.
- B – C :** Line passes through village Pimpri along the outer boundary of plot numbers 51, 40, crosses common village boundary of villages Pimpri and Kolera and outer boundary of plot numbers 62, 61 and meets at point 'C'.
- C – D :** Line passes through village Kolera along the outer boundary of plot numbers 61, 60, 54, crosses road and outer boundary of plot numbers 54, 42/1- 42/2, 43/1- 43/2, 31/1- 31/2- 31/3- 31/4- 31/5, 30/1- 30/2, crosses road and along the outer boundary of road, Abadi and plot numbers 161, 162, 189, 188, 186, 182, 181, 179/1- 179/2, 176, then crosses common village boundary of villages Kolera and Bramhni and outer boundary of plot numbers 71, 70/1- 70/2, then crosses common village boundary of villages Bramhni and Gowari and passes along the outer boundary of plot numbers 72, 73, 92/1- 92/2, 106, 110, 111, 133/1- 133/2 and meets at point 'D'.
- D – A :** Line passes through village Gowari along with the outer boundary of plot numbers 133/1- 133/2, 137 and meets at starting point 'A'.

Schedule (Part – 'B')

Kolar-Pimpri Deep Extension Block
Wani North Area, District Yavatmal, (Maharashtra)

All Rights (Plan No. C-1(E)III/JJNR/731-0305 dated the 31st March, 2005).

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Aheri	32	Wani	Yavatmal	43.52	Part

Total area : 43.52 hectares (approximately)
 or 107.53 acres (approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Aheri: -

230/1A- 230/1B- 230/2- 230/3, 231/1- 231/2, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288/1A- 288/1B- 288/2A- 288/2B- 288/3A- 288/3B, 297/1- 297/2- 297/3- 297/4, 298/1- 298/2- 298/3- 298/4, 299, 300/1- 300/2, Road (Part).

Boundary Description :-

E – F : Line start from point 'E' and passes through village Aheri along with the Southern Bank of Wardha River and outer boundary of plot numbers 297/1- 297/2- 297/3- 297/4, 299, 300/1- 300/2 and meets at point 'F'.

F – G : Line passes through village Aheri along with the outer boundary of plot numbers 300/1- 300/2, 288/1A- 288/1B- 288/2A- 288/2B- 288/3A- 288/3B, crosses road then passes along the outer boundary of plot numbers 285, 284, 283, 282, 281, 236, 235, 233, 232, 231/1- 231/2, 230/1A- 230/1B- 230/2- 230/3 and meets at point 'G'.

G – H : Line passes through village Aheri along with the outer boundary of plot numbers 230/1A- 230/1B- 230/2- 230/3 and meets at point 'H'.

H – E : Line passes through village Aheri along with the outer boundary of plot numbers 230/1A- 230/1B- 230/2- 230/3, 231/1- 231/2, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 280, 279, crosses road and passes along the outer boundary of plot numbers 278, 277, 288/1A- 288/1B- 288/2A- 288/2B- 288/3A- 288/3B, 298/1- 298/2- 298/3- 298/4, 297/1- 297/2- 297/3- 297/4 and meets at starting point 'E'.

SCHEDULE (PART – 'C')

**Kolar-Pimpri Deep Extension Block
Wani North Area, District Yavatmal (Maharashtra)**

All Rights (Plan No. C-1(E)III/JJNR/731-0305 dated the 31st March, 2005)

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Aheri	32	Wani	Yavatmal	55.48	Part
2	Borgaon	33	Wani	Yavatmal	58.48	

Total area : 113.96 hectares (approximately)
or 281.60 acres (approximately)

All Rights :-

Schedule 'A' + Schedule 'B' + Schedule 'C' = Total Area

239.77 + 43.52 + 113.96 = 397.25 hectares
(approximately)

592.47 + 107.53 + 281.60 = 981.60 acres
(approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Aheri :-

1 (Part), 2 (Part), 3, 4 (Part), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9/1- 9/2- 9/3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15/1- 15/2, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 (Part), 30, 31 (Part), 32 (Part), 33, 34, 35 (Part), 36 (Part), 48/1 (Part), 48/1A, 48/2 (Part), 49, 50 (Part), 51/2- 51/3 - 51/4 (Part), 60/1 (Part), Road (Part).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Borgaon :-

79, 94/A- 94/B- 94/C, 98, 99, 100, 101/1- 101/2, 102, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139/2, 140/2A, 143/2, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151/1- 151/1A- 151/2, 153, 154, 155/1- 155/2, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160/1- 160/2, 161, 162/1- 162/2, 163, 168, 169.

Boundary Description: -

- F – I :** Line starts from point 'F' and passes through village Aheri along the Southern Bank of Wardha River and outer boundary of plot numbers 2, 3, 7, 8, 9/1- 9/2- 9/3, 11, 12 and meets at point 'I'.
- I – J :** Line passes along the common village boundary of villages Aheri and Borgaon and outer boundary of plot numbers 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, then proceeds through village Borgaon along the outer boundary of plot numbers 169, 168, 163, 161, 158, 155/1- 155/2, 94/A- 94/B- 94/C, 98, 99, 100, 79, and meets at point 'J'.
- J – K :** Line passes through village Borgaon along the outer boundary of plot numbers 79, 102, 101/1- 101/2, 136, 135, 134 and meets at point 'K'.
- K – F :** Line passes through village Borgaon along the outer boundary of plot numbers 134, 140/2A, 139/2, 143/2, 152/2, crosses common village boundary of villages Borgaon and Aheri then proceeds through plot numbers 60/1 (Part), 50 (Part), 51/2- 52/3- 53/4 (Part), 48/1 (Part)- 48/1A- 48/2 (Part), 31 (Part), 29 (Part), 32 (Part), 35 (Part), 36 (Part), crosses road then proceeds through plot numbers 4 (Part), 1 (Part), 2 (Part) and meets at starting point 'F'.

[No. 43015/15/2004-PRIW]
M. SHAHABUDEEN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3591—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 5 फरवरी, 2005 में पृष्ठ 1108 से 1109 पर प्रकाशित की गई थी, भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का. आ. सं. 401, तारीख 25 जनवरी, 2005 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में, जिसका माप 814.60 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 2012.95 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह समाधान हो गया है, कि उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित उक्त भूमि के एक भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 340.73 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 841.94 एकड़ (लगभग) माप वाली भूमि और ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है:-

टिप्पण- 1 इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. सी.- 1 (ई) II/ एफआर/ 734-0705 तारीख 4 जुलाई, 2005 का निरीक्षण कलेक्टर, नागपुर (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता - 700 001 के कार्यालय में या वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व विभाग) कोल ईस्टेट, सिविल लाईन्स, नागपुर - 440 001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकेगा।

टिप्पणी- 2 उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध है:-

अर्जन की बाबत आपत्तियाँ:

8(1) कोई व्यक्ति, जो किसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिनों के भीतर संपूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण:- इस धारा के अर्थान्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी, कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियण करना चाहता है और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है, वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा, जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता, यदि भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर दिए जाते हैं।

टिप्पण 3:- केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता -700 001 को उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 21 जून, 1983 में प्रकाशित अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ.1519 तारीख 27 मई, 1983 द्वारा सक्षम प्राधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया है।

अनुसूची
नया सिंगोरी खंड नागपुर क्षेत्र
जिला नागपुर (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं.सी - 1(ई)III /एफआर/734-0705 तारीख 4 जुलाई, 2005)

क्रम संख्या	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्किल संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणी
1	झोरली	12	पारसिवनी	नागपुर	41.20	भाग
2	साहोली	12	पारसिवनी	नागपुर	125.45	भाग
3	सिंगोरी	12	पारसिवनी	नागपुर	174.08	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र:- 340.73 हेक्टर (लगभग)

या 841.94 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम झोरली में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्यांक:

97, 98, 99/1- 99/2, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113/1- 113/2, 114, 115, 118, 119, नाला (भाग) ।

ग्राम साहोली में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्यांक:

3/1- 3/2, 4/1- 4/2, 7, 8/1- 8/2- 8/3- 8/4- 8/5- 8/6, 11, 12, 13, 14/1- 14/2(भाग), 44/1- 44/2- 44/3- 44/4, 46, 47/1- 47/2, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54/1- 54/2, 55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65/1- 65/2, 66/1- 66/2- 66/3, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77/1- 77/2, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82/1- 82/2, 83/1- 83/2- 83/3- 83/4, 84/1- 84/2- 84/3, 85, 86/1- 86/2, 87/1- 87/2, 88, 89, 90/1- 90/2- 90/3, 91, 92, 93/1- 93/2(भाग), 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103(भाग), सड़क (भाग) ।

ग्राम सिंगोरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्यांक:

59/1- 59/2 (भाग), 60/1- 60/2- 60/3(भाग), 66/1- 66/2(भाग), 67, 68/1- 68/2- 68/3(भाग), 71(भाग), 72, 73 नाला (भाग), 77(भाग), 78(भाग), 79/1- 79/2(भाग), 80(भाग), 81(भाग), 82(भाग), 83(भाग), 84/1- 84/2, 85, 86, 87(नाला), 88, 91(नाला), 93/1- 93/2, 95/1- 95/2- 95/3(भाग), 96, 97/1- 97/2, 98, 99, 103 सड़क(भाग), 104 सड़क(भाग), 105/1- 105/2, 106, 107/1- 107/2- 107/3, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, (नाला) 134/1- 134/2, 135 (नाला), 136, 137, 138, 139, 140 (नाला), 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147/1- 147/2, 148/1- 148/2- 148/3, 149, 150, 151, 153, 158, 159/1- 159/2, 160, 161/1- 161/2, 162/1- 162/2- 162/3, 163, 164 सड़क(भाग), 167, 168, 169, 170, 171 सड़क(भाग), 172/1- 172/2- 172/3(भाग), 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178/1- 178/2- 178/3, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184 ।

सीमा वर्णन:

क - ख: रेखा बिन्दु 'क' से आरम्भ होती है और ग्राम सिंगोरी से होकर गुजरती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 59/1-59/2, 60/1- 60/2- 60/3, 66/1- 66/2, 68/1- 68/2- 68/3, 71 में से आगे बढ़ती है और नाला पार करती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 77, 78, 79/1- 79/2, 80, 81, 82,

83 में से आगे बढ़ती हुई ग्राम सिंगोरी और हिंगणा (बाराभाई) की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा पर बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।

ख - ग: रेखा ग्राम सिंगोरी से होकर गुजरती है और ग्राम सिंगोरी और हिंगणा (बाराभाई) की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 83, 85, 86, की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और ग्राम सिंगोरी, हिंगणा (बाराभाई) तथा डोरली की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा पर बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।

ग - घ: रेखा ग्राम सिंगोरी से होकर गुजरती है और ग्राम सिंगोरी और डोरली की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा से गुजरती हुई प्लॉट संख्यांक 134/1- 134/2 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और फिर ग्राम सिंगोरी तथा डोरली की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा को पार करती है और ग्राम डोरली से होती हुई प्लॉट संख्यांक 111, 119, 118, 115, 97 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।

घ - ड: रेखा ग्राम डोरली से होकर प्लॉट संख्यांक 97, 98 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और ग्राम डोरली और साहोली की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा पर बिन्दु 'ड.' पर मिलती है।

ड - च: रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 102, 97, 96, 93/1- 93/2, 86/1- 86/2 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम साहोली से होकर गुजरती हुई सड़क पार करती है और आगे बढ़ती हुई प्लॉट संख्यांक 63, 64, 46, 58, 57 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती हुई सड़क पार करती हुई आगे बढ़ती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 44/1- 44/2- 44/3- 44/4 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती हुई बिन्दु 'च' पर मिलती है।

च - छ: रेखा ग्राम साहोली से होकर प्लॉट संख्यांक 14/1- 14/2 से होकर गुजरती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 11, 7, 4/1- 4/2, 3/1- 3/2, की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती है और ग्राम साहोली और सिंगोरी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा पर बिन्दु 'छ' पर मिलती है।

छ-ज-झ-क: रेखा प्लॉट संख्यांक 181, 179, 182, 183, 184, 172/1- 172/2- 172/3 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम सिंगोरी से होकर गुजरती हुई सड़क पार करती है और आगे बढ़ती है और प्लॉट संख्या 167 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और फिर से सड़क पार करती है तथा प्लॉट संख्यांक 158, 159/1-159/2, 153, 150, 103, 105/1- 105/2 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती हुई सड़क पार करती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 95/1- 95/2- 95/3 में से आगे बढ़ती हुई प्लॉट संख्यांक 93/1- 93/2, 91, 59/1- 59/2 की बाह्य सीमा के साथ गुजरती जाती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. आर-43015/27/2004-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

एम. शाहबुद्दीन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2005

S. O. 3591.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 401 dated the 25th January, 2005 issued under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and published in Part – II, section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 5th February, 2005 at pages 1108 to 1109, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 814.60 hectares (approximately) or 2012.95 acres (approximately) of the land in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification ;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said land described in the Schedule appended to this notification ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the land measuring 340.73 hectares (approximately) or 841.94 acres (approximately) and all rights in or over such land as described in the Schedule appended hereto.

Note 1 The plan bearing No. C-1(E)III/FR/734-0705 dated the 4th July, 2005 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Nagpur (Maharashtra) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata (Pin 700 001) or in the office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Department), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur – 440 001 (Maharashtra).

Note 2 Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the said Act which provides as follows :-

Objections to acquisition :

“ 8. (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation :- It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further enquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of Section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act.”

Note 3 :- The Coal Controller, 1, Council house Street, Kolkata – 700 001, has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the said Act, vide notification number S.O. 2519 dated the 27th May, 1983, published in Part – II, section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 11th June, 1983.

Schedule

New Singori Block, Nagpur Area, District Nagpur (Maharashtra)

(Plan No. C-1(E)III/FR/734-0705 dated the 4th July, 2005).

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1	Dorli	12	Parseoni	Nagpur	41.20	Part
2	Saholi	12	Parseoni	Nagpur	125.45	Part
3	Singori	12	Parseoni	Nagpur	174.08	Part

Total area : 340.73 hectares (approximately)
Or 841.94 acres (approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Dorli :

97, 98, 99/1- 99/2, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113/1- 113/2, 114, 115, 118, 119, Nallah (part).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Saholi :

3/1- 3/2, 4/1- 4/2, 7, 8/1- 8/2- 8/3- 8/4- 8/5- 8/6, 11, 12, 13, 14/1- 14/2 (part), 44/1- 44/2- 44/3- 44/4, 46, 47/1- 47/2, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54/1- 54/2, 55, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65/1- 65/2, 66/1- 66/2- 66/3, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77/1- 77/2, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82/1- 82/2, 83/1- 83/2- 83/3- 83/4, 84/1- 84/2- 84/3, 85, 86/1- 86/2, 87/1- 87/2, 88, 89, 90/1- 90/2- 90/3, 91, 92, 93/1- 93/2 (part), 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103 (part), Road (part).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Singori :

59/1- 59/2 (part), 60/1- 60/2- 60/3 (part), 66/1- 66/2 (part), 67, 68/1- 68/2- 68/3 (part), 71 (part), 72, 73 Nallah (part), 77 (part), 78 (part), 79/1- 79/2 (part), 80 (part), 81 (part), 82 (part), 83 (part), 84/1- 84/2, 85, 86, 87 (Nallah), 88, 91 (Nallah), 93/1- 93/2, 95/1- 95/2- 95/3 (part), 96, 97/1- 97/2, 98, 99, 103 Road (part), 104 Road (part), 105/1- 105/2, 106, 107/1- 107/2- 107/3, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133 (Nallah), 134/1- 134/2, 135 (Nallah), 136, 137, 138, 139, 140 (Nallah), 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147/1- 147/2, 148/1- 148/2- 148/3, 149, 150, 151, 153, 158, 159/1- 159/2, 160, 161/1- 161/2, 162/1- 162/2- 162/3, 163, 164 Road (part), 167, 168, 169, 170, 171 Road (part), 172/1- 172/2- 172/3 (part), 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178/1- 178/2- 178/3, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184.

Boundary description :

- A – B :** Line starts from point 'A' and passes through village Singori and proceeds through plot numbers 59/1- 59/2, 60/1- 60/2- 60/3, 66/1- 66/2, 68/1- 68/2- 68/3, 71 crosses nallah then proceeds through plot numbers 77, 78, 79/1- 79/2, 80, 81, 82, 83 and meets on common village boundary of villages Singori and Hingna (Barabhai) at point 'B'.
- B – C :** Line passes through village Singori along with the common village boundary of villages Singori and Hingna (Barabhai) along the outer boundary of plot numbers 83, 85, 86 of village Singori and meets on common village boundary of villages Singori, Hingna (Barabhai) and Dorli at point 'C'.
- C – D :** Line passes through village Singori along the common village boundary of villages Singori and Dorli and the outer boundary of plot numbers 134/1- 134/2 then crosses village boundary and passes through village Dorli along the outer boundary of plot numbers 111, 119, 118, 115, 97 and meets at point 'D'.
- D – E :** Line passes through village Dorli along the outer boundary of plot numbers 97, 98 and meets on common village boundary of villages Dorli and Saholi at point 'E'.
- E – F :** Line passes through village Saholi along the outer boundary of plot numbers 102, 97, 96, 93/1- 93/2, 86/1- 86/2 crosses road then proceeds along the outer boundary of plot numbers 63, 64, 46, 58, 57 again crosses road then proceeds along the outer boundary of plot numbers 44/1- 44/2- 44/3- 44/4 and meets at point 'F'.
- F – G :** Line passes through village Saholi and plot numbers 14/1- 14/2 then proceeds along the outer boundary of plot numbers 11, 7, 4/1- 4/2, 3/1- 3/2 and meets on common village boundary of villages Saholi and Singori at point 'G'.
- G-H-I-A :** Line passes through village Singori along with the outer boundary of plot numbers 181, 179, 182, 183, 184, 172/1- 172/2- 172/3 crosses road then proceeds along the outer boundary of plot number 167 again crosses road then passes along the outer boundary of plot numbers 158, 159/1- 159/2, 153, 150, 151, 103, 105/1- 105/2 crosses road then passes through plot numbers 95/1- 95/2- 95/3 and outer boundary of plot numbers 93/1- 93/2, 91, 59/1- 59/2 and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 43015/27/2004-PRIW]
M. SHAHABUDEEN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3592.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 16 अक्टूबर, 2004 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का. आ. सं. 2573, तारीख 30 सितम्बर, 2004 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संपादित अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में, जिसका माप 580.000 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 1433.18 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह समाधान हो गया है, कि उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित उक्त भूमि के एक भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ;

और अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 297.656 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 735.50 एकड़ (लगभग) माप की भूमि में सभी अधिकारों का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है:-

टिप्पण- 1 इस अधिसूचना के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. एसईसीएल/ बीएसपी/जीएम (पीएलजी)/भूमि/298 तारीख 18 मई, 2005 का निरीक्षण कलेक्टर, सरगुजा (छत्तीसगढ़) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता- 700 001 के कार्यालय में या साउथ इस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग) सीपत रोड, बिलासपुर-495006 (छत्तीसगढ़) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

टिप्पण- 2 उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध है:-

अर्जन की बाबत आपत्तियाँ:-

- 8 (1) कोई व्यक्ति, जो किसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिनों के भीतर संपूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण:- इस धारा के अर्थान्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी, कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

- (2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति संक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और संक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है, वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।

- (3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा, जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता, यदि भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते हैं।

टिप्पण 3:- केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता -700 001 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 4 अप्रैल, 1987 के पृष्ठ 1397 से 1400 में प्रकाशित अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 905 तारीख 20 मार्च, 1987 द्वारा संक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

अनुसूची
महान ॥ विवृत परियोजना
भटगांव क्षेत्र, जिला सरगुजा (छत्तीसगढ़)

सभी अधिकार

(क) राजस्व भूमि

क्रम संख्या	ग्राम का नाम	ग्राम संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पण
1	चउरा	35	राजपुर	सरगुजा	181.552	भाग
2	परसवारकला	36	राजपुर	सरगुजा	088.857	भाग
				योग	270.409	हेक्टेयर

(ख) आरक्षित वन

क्रमांक सं.	कम्पार्टमेंट नंबर	रेंज	प्रभाग	क्षेत्र हैक्टर में	टिप्पण
1.	पी 142	प्रतापपुर	उत्तर सरगुजा	27.247	भाग
योग :- 27.247 हैक्टर					
कुल योग: (क+ख) 270.409+27.247 =297.656 हेक्टर(लगभग) या 735.50 एकड़ (लगभग)					

1) ग्राम चउरा(भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्याक:-

361(भाग), 622(भाग), 626 से 644, 645 (भाग), 648(भाग), 649(भाग), 651(भाग), 652(भाग), 653(भाग), 657(भाग), 658 (भाग), 659 से 670, 671 (भाग), 672 से 673, 674(भाग), 675 से 677, 678 (भाग), 679 से 686, 678(भाग), 910(भाग), 911 (भाग) 912(भाग), 924(भाग), 927 (भाग), 928 (भाग), 929 (भाग), 930, 931 (भाग), 932 से 963, 964 (भाग). 965 से 1033, 1034(भाग), 1035 (भाग), 1036.

2.) ग्राम परसवार कला(भाग) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्याक:-

10 (भाग), 11 (भाग), 13 (भाग), 14 से 16, 17 (भाग), 18 से 19, 20(भाग), 21 से 45, 46 (भाग), 47 (भाग), 48 से 53, 54 (भाग), 59 (भाग), 60, 61 (भाग), 85, 86(भाग), 88 (भाग), 89 (भाग), 90 से 92, 93 (भाग), 97 (भाग), 627(भाग), 628 (भाग), 630(भाग), 631 से 632, 633 (भाग), 634 से 635, 636(भाग), 637(भाग), 638 से 647, 648(भाग), 649 (भाग), 654(भाग), 1356, 1502, 1504, 1505(भाग)

3) आरक्षित वन में अर्जित किए जाने वाले कम्पार्टमेंट संख्याक पी 142(भाग)

इसमें ग्राम चउरा के प्लॉट संख्या 1033, 1034(भाग), 1035(भाग) एवं ग्राम परसवार कला के प्लॉट संख्या 648(भाग) एवं 649(भाग) सम्मिलित है।

सीमा वर्णन:

क - ख:

रेखा घोघर नाले के किनारे बिन्दु "क" से आरम्भ होती है और ग्राम घोघर नाले के पूर्वी किनारे के साथ गुजरती हुई बिन्दु "ख" पर मिलती है।

- ख - ग: रेखा ग्राम चउरा के प्लाट संख्या 678, 674, 671, 657, 658, 653, 652, 651, 649, 648, 622, 645, 622, 361 से गुजरती हुई बिंदु 'ग' पर मिलती है।
- ग - घ: रेखा ग्राम चउरा के प्लाट संख्या 1035 से प्लाट संख्या 1033 की उत्तरी दिशा, प्लाट संख्या 1034 से, बाद में ग्राम परसवार कला में प्रवेश करती है और प्लाट संख्या 648, 1505, 649 से होकर आरक्षित वन कम्पार्टमेंट संख्या पी 142 से भी गुजरती हुई बिंदु 'च' पर मिलती है।
- घ - छ: रेखा ग्राम परसवार कला के प्लाट संख्या 649, 637, 654, 636, 633, 627, 628, 630, 54, 59, 61, 47 से भागत: प्लाट संख्या 49 की पूर्वी सीमा, तत्पश्चात् प्लाट संख्या 46 से गुजरती हुई बिंदु 'ज' पर मिलती है।
- छ1-ज: रेखा ग्राम परसवार कला के प्लाट संख्या 46 से प्लाट संख्या 85.86 की दक्षिणी सीमा के साथ, प्लाट संख्या 86, 88, 89, 88, 93, 97, 20, 17, 13, 11, 10 से गुजरती हुई बिंदु 'ज1' पर मिलती है।
- ज1-झ-क: रेखा भागत: ग्राम चउरा-परसवार कला ग्रामों की सम्मिलित सीमा, से होकर ग्राम चउरा में प्रवेश करती है और प्लाट संख्या 964, 927, 924, 927, 924, 928, 929, 911, 912, 910, 931, 878 से गुजरती हुई आरंभिक बिंदु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[फा. सं. बार-43015/23/2004-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

एम. शहाबुद्दीन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th September, 2005.

S. O. 3592.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal, number S.O. 2573 dated the 30th September, 2004, issued under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and published in Part-II, section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 16th October, 2004, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 580.000 hectares (approximately) or 1433.18 acres (approximately) of the land in the locality specified in the schedule annexed to that notification;

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said land;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the land measuring 297.656 hectares (approximately) or 735.50 acres (approximately) in all rights in the schedule appended hereto.

Note 1 - The plan bearing No/SECL/BSP/GM(Plg)/Land/298 dated the 18th May, 2005 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Surguja (Chhattisgarh) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata 700 001 or in the Office of the South Eastern Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Seepat Road, Bilaspur- 495 006 (Chhattisgarh).

Note 2 - Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the said Act, which provides as follows:-

Objection to Acquisition.

" 8. (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation:- It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing, and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further inquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either makes a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section(1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendation on the objections together with the record of the proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act.

Note:3 The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta 700 001 has been appointed by the Central Government, as the competent authority under section 3 of the said Act, vide notification under S.O 905, dated the 20th March, 1987, published in Part-II, Section - 3, sub-section(ii) of the gazette of India, dated the 4th April, 1987 at pages 1397 to 1400.

Schedule

**Mahan - II Opencast Project
Bhatgaon Area, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh**

All rights**(A) Revenue Land**

Sl. No.	Name of village	Village number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1.	chaura	35	Rajpur	Surguja	181.552	Part
2.	Paraswar kala	36	Rajpur	Surguja	088.857	Part
Total :- 270.409 hectares						

(B) Reserved Forest

Sl. NO.	Compartment number	Range	Division	Area in hectares	Remarks
1.	P 142	Pratappur	North Surguja	27.247	Part
Total :- 27.247 Hectares					
Grand Total: (A+B) 270.409+27.247 = 297.656 hectares (approximately)					
or = 737.50 acres (approximately)					

1. Plot numbers to be acquired in village Chaura (Part) :

361(Part), 622(Part), 626 to 644, 645(Part), 648(Part), 649(Part), 651(Part), 652(Part), 653(Part), 657(Part), 658 (Part), 659 to 670, 671 (Part), 672 to 673, 674(Part), 675 to 677, 678 (Part), 679 to 686, 878(Part), 910(Part), 911 (Part), 912(Part), 924(Part), 927 (Part), 928 (Part), 929 (Part), 930, 931 (Part), 932 to 963, 964 (Part), 965 to 1033, 1034(Part), 1035 (Part), 1036.

2. Plot numbers to be acquired in village Paraswar kala (Part):

10 (Part), 11 (Part), 13 (Part), 14 to 16, 17 (Part), 18 to 19, 20(Part), 21 to 45, 46 (Part), 47 (Part), 48 to 53, 54 (Part), 59 (Part), 60, 61 (Part), 85, 86(Part), 88 (Part), 89 (Part), 90 to 92, 93 (Part), 97 (Part), 627(Part), 628 (Part), 630 (Part), 631 to 632, 633 (Part), 634 to 635, 636(Part), 637(Part), 638 to 647, 648 (Part), 649 (Part), 654 (Part), 1356, 1502, 1504, 1505(Part).

3. Reserved Forest Compartment to be acquired : P 142 (Part):

(In this plot numbers 1033, 1034 (Part), 1035 (Part) of village Chaura and plot numbers 648 (part) 649 (part) of village Paraswar kala are included).

Boundary Description :

- A-B Line starts from point "A" on the bank of Ghoghar nalla and passes along the Eastern bank of Ghoghar nalla and meets at point "B".
- B-C Line passes in village Chaura through plot numbers 678, 674, 671, 657, 658, 653, 652, 651, 649, 648, 622, 645, 622, 361 and meets at point "C".
- C-D- Line passes in village Chaura through plot number 1035 northern boundary
E-F of plot number 1033, through plot number 1034 then enter in village Paraswar kala passes through plot numbers 648, 1505, 649 which is also through Reserved forest compartment number P 142 and meets at point "F".
- F-G- Line passes in village Paraswar kala and passes through plot numbers
G1-H 649, 637, 654, 636, 633, 627, 628, 630, 54, 59, 61, 47 partly Eastern boundary of plot number 49 then through plot number 46 and meets at point "H".
- H-H1 Line passes in village Paraswar kala and passes through Plot numbers 46 along the Southern boundary of plot numbers 85, 86 then through Plot numbers 86, 88, 89, 88, 93, 97, 20, 17, 13, 11, 10 and meets at point "H1".
- H1-I-A- Line passes along the partly common boundary of villages Chaura-Paraswar kala then enter in village Chaura and passes through Plot numbers 964, 927, 924, 927, 924, 928, 929, 911, 912, 910, 931, 878 and meets at the starting point "A".

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3593.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हिन्दुस्तान कॉपर लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद संख्या-1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 117/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-43011/3/1999-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. —In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 117/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 1 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of M/s. H. C. Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-43011/3/1999-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a Reference U/s 10(1)(d)(2A) of I.D. Act,

Reference No. 117 of 2000

PERTIES:

Employees in relation to the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd.

AND**Their Workman****PRESENT:**

Shri Sarju Prasad, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers : Shri D. K. Verma, Advocate.

For the Workman : Shri K. Chakravarty, Advocate

State : Jharkhand. : Industry : Copper

Dated, 12th August, 2005

AWARD

By Order No. L-43011/3/99/IR(M) dated 18-2-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-sec. (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd., Ghatsila in suspending the production of mineral from August 1999 in Pathargora and

Kendadih Mines amounts to closure of mines and whether this is fair, legal and justified?”

“Whether the action of the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd. Ghatsila in denying the monetary dues of D.A., L.T.C., Leave encashment and amenities of health, Canteen, electricity and water supply etc. to workmen employed in Pathargoda and Kendadih Mines is fair, legal and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?”

2. On 11-8-2005 Shri K. Chakravarty, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the concerned workman submitted that the concerned workmen are not interested to contest the case and also prayed for passing of a “No Dispute” award in this case.

3. In view of the prayer being made on behalf of the concerned workmen, I render a “No Dispute” Award in this case.

SARJU PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3594.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयरपोर्ट ऑथोरिटी ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली संख्या-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 27(ए)/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11011/39/2003-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. 3594.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 27(A)/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi No. II as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of Airport Authority of India, Terminal-II Delite Engineers and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-11011/39/2003-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, NEW DELHI**

I. D. No. 27(A)/2004

Presiding Officer : R. N. RAI

IN THE MATTER OF:

Shri Virender Kumar & 23 others,
C/o, General Secretary,
Airport Employees Union
3-V.P. House,
Rafi Marg, New Delhi-110001.

Versus

1. The Asstt. General Manager (P),
Airport Authority of India,
Terminal-11,
New Delhi.
2. M/s. Delite Engineers,
6, Jolly Street, Tilak Road,
Santa Cruz West,
Mumbai.

AWARD

The Ministry of labour by its letter No. L-11011/39/2003-IR (M) Central Government Dt. 22-1-2004 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder :—

“Whether the demand of Airport Employees Union for regularization of services of S/Shri Virender Kumar and 23 others contract workers (List enclosed) under the Airport Authority of India, New Delhi is justified? If yes, to what relief the workmen are entitled to and from what date.”

It transpires from perusal of the order sheet that notices to the workmen were sent but the workmen applicants did not turn up. The management has been present all along. The workmen applicants have not filed claim statement despite service of notice.

No dispute award is given.

Date: 25-8-2005

R. N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3595.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूरैनियम कार्पो. ऑफ इण्डिया लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद संख्या-1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 18/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/95/2001-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. 3595.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 18/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 1 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. and their workman, received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-29012/95/2001-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD**

**In the matter of a Reference U/s 10(1)(d)(2A) of I.D.
Act,**

Reference No. 18 of 2002

PETIES:

Employers in relation to the management of
M/s. Uranium Corporation of India Ltd.

AND**Their Workmen****PRESENT:**

Shri Sarju Prasad, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers : Shri P. R. Rakhit,
Advocate.

For the Workman : None.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Uranium

Dated the 1st August, 2005

AWARD

By Order No. L-29012/95/2001 IR(M) dated 6-2-2001 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

“Whether the action of the management in reducing pay scale of Shri P. K. Singh, Head Security Guard of UCIL is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?”

2. This reference case is of the year 2002. Despite notice issued to the sponsoring union, even on 27-7-2005 neither the sponsoring union nor the concerned workman appeared to take any step in this case. It, therefore, seems that they are not interested to contest the case.

3. Under such circumstances, I render a ‘No Dispute’ Award in the present reference case.

SARJU PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3596.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उदयपुर मिनरल डवलपमेंट सिंडिकेट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, अजमेर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 11/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/25/2003-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. 3596.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 11/2003) of the Industrial Tribunal Ajmer as shown in the

Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of Udaipur Mineral Development Syndicate Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-29012/25/2003-JR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

अनुबंध

न्यायालय श्रम न्यायालय एवं औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण,
अजमेर

सी आई टी आर 11/03

केन्द्र सरकार रेफरेंस संख्या 29012/25/2003 दि. 27-8-05

श्री कमल व्यास पुत्र श्री हरिशंकर व्यास, निवासी ब्रह्मपुरी,
गुलाबबाड़ी, पुराने बस स्टैंड के पास, गुलाबपुरा (भीलवाड़ा)

—प्रार्थी-श्रमिक

बनाम

जनरल मैनेजर, उदयपुर मिनरल्स डेवलपमेंट सिंडीकेट लिमिटेड,
भीलवाड़ा (राज.)

—अप्रार्थी-नियोजक

समक्ष : सी गंगासिंह शेखावत आर एच जे एस

प्रार्थी की ओर से : श्री जे. एल. शर्मा विद्वान अधिवक्ता, प्रार्थी

अप्रार्थी की ओर से : सी आर एस सोडाणी विद्वान अधिवक्ता
अप्रार्थी

दि. 3-8-2005

अवाई

केन्द्र सरकार से यह रेफरेंस प्राप्त हुआ है जो निम्न प्रकार है :—

“क्या महाप्रबंधक मैसर्स उदयपुर मिनरल्स डेवलपमेंट सिंडीकेट प्रा.लि. भीलवाड़ा अपने कर्मकार श्री कमल व्यास पुत्र श्री हरिशंकर व्यास को सहायक डीजल मेकेनिक के पद से दिनांक 10-9-98 को सेवा से बरखास्त करना उचित एवं वैध है ? यदि नहीं तो श्रमिक किस राहत को प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी है ? ”

नोटिस जारी करने के उपरांत प्रार्थी ने अपना स्टेटमेंट आफ क्लेम जरिये अपने अधिवक्ता प्रस्तुत किया जिसमें उसने कथन किया है कि प्रार्थी को अप्रार्थी नियोजक ने नियुक्ति पत्र दि. 22-12-93 द्वारा डीजल मेकेनिक (अप्रेंटिस) के पद पर एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिये नियुक्त किया था। प्रार्थी को दि. 1-4-95 से सहायक डीजल मेकेनिक के पद पर कन्फर्म कर दिया तथा दि. 1-4-95 से ही नियमित वेतन श्रृंखला के अनुसार वेतन देना आरम्भ कर दिया। प्रार्थी को एक कारण बताओ नोटिस पत्र सं. 622 दि. 10-6-98 द्वारा जारी किया जिसमें श्रमिक द्वारा दि. 9-6-98 को सांय करीब 9.30 बजे अप्रार्थी नियोजक की भीलवाड़ा आफिस की जीप सं. 3208 परिसर में बाहर ले जाकर दुर्घटनाग्रस्त करने का कथन अंकित कर 24 घंटे के भीतर स्पष्टीकरण मांगा व स्पष्टीकरण प्रस्तुत नहीं करने की स्थिति में अनुशासनात्मक कार्यवाही अमल में लाने का उल्लेख किया। उक्त नोटिस में यह भी उल्लेख किया गया कि प्रार्थी श्रमिक की इस कारण नौकरी से बर्खास्तगी तक हो सकती है। उक्त कारण बताओं नोटिस का जवाब देते हुए प्रार्थी ने अप्रार्थी से कथन किया है कि दुर्घटना के समय वाहन चालक श्री हीरालाल के द्वारा वाहन चलाया जा रहा था। प्रार्थी की उपरोक्त दुर्घटना बावत किसी प्रकार की कोई गलती नहीं थी। नियोजक ने श्रमिक को यह भी धमकी दी कि वह कारण बताओ नोटिस के जवाब में हीरालाल

वाहन चालक द्वारा वाहन चलाने का उल्लेख नहीं करेगा। और यदि इस कारण बताओ नोटिस के जवाब में श्रमिक ने हीरालाल का नाम नहीं बताया तो उसकी नौकरी पर किसी प्रकार की आंच नहीं आएगी और यदि उसने फिर भी हीरालाल वाहन चालक के नाम का उल्लेख कारण बताओ नोटिस के जवाब में प्रस्तुत किया तो नौकरी से बर्खास्त कर देगा। अप्रार्थी के द्वारा दी गई इसी धमकी से भयभीत होकर उसने इस कारण बताओं नोटिस में हीरालाल वाहन चालक का नाम नहीं बताया। जबकि वास्तविकता यह थी कि दुर्घटना के समय वाहन हीरालाल वाहन चालक के द्वारा ही चलाया जा रहा था। प्रार्थी के द्वारा कारण बताओ नोटिस का जवाब प्रस्तुत करने के काफी समय बाद दिनांक 23-6-98 को नियोजक द्वारा आरोप पत्र/निलंबन पत्र जारी कर भीलवाड़ा फैक्ट्री के मुख्य दरवाजे पर सुबह 11.00 बजे उपस्थिति दर्ज करवाने के निर्देश प्रदान किये गये।

प्रार्थी की ओर से यह भी कथन किया है कि अप्रार्थी, द्वारा जारी आरोपपत्र/निलम्बन पत्र में किसी भी आरोप का उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। अतः इसे किसी भी रूप में आरोप पत्र नहीं माना जा सकता है। अप्रार्थी ने प्रार्थी के द्वारा मांगे गये दस्तावेजात भी उपलब्ध नहीं कराये और ना ही प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों की पालना नहीं की गई है। अप्रार्थी द्वारा प्रार्थी को जिरह का अवसर भी नहीं दिया। इस प्रकार प्रार्थी ने अप्रार्थी के द्वारा की गई जांच को शून्य व निरस्तनीय कराने की प्रार्थना की है। प्रार्थी द्वारा आगे यह भी कथन किया गया है कि हीरालाल वाहन चालक के विरुद्ध पुलिस में एफ आई आर सं. 43/98 दिनांक 15-7-98 को जी आर पी पुलिस थाना भीलवाड़ा में दर्ज करवाई गई थी। उपरोक्त दुर्घटना में रेलवे की बाउण्ड्री को टक्कर मारकर तोड़ दी थी जिससे रेलवे की दीवार टूट गई व जीप सं. 3208 को भी क्षति पहुंची। उपरोक्त मामलों में वाहन चालक हीरालाल के विरुद्ध धारा 279, 427 भारतीय दण्ड संहिता के तहत मुकदमा दर्ज हुआ था। इस प्रकरण में अप्रार्थी नियोजक को धारा 133 एम.वी.एक्ट का नोटिस दिया गया और चालक का नाम पूछा गया कि दुर्घटना के वक्त कौन वाहन को चला रहा था जिससे अप्रार्थी नियोजक ने दुर्घटना के समय हीरालाल के द्वारा वाहन चलाने की बात लिखी है। उपरोक्त दुर्घटना का मुकदमा रेलवे कोर्ट में चला था और रेलवे कोर्ट के निर्णय दिनांक 1-3-2000 में हीरालाल पुत्र सावता को दोषी पाया व इन धाराओं में सजा सुनाई। इस प्रकार रेलवे कोर्ट, अजमेर के द्वारा हीरालाल को दोषी ठहराने से यह निर्विवाद रूप से साबित है कि दुर्घटना के वक्त हीरालाल ही वाहन को चला रहा था। अंत में प्रार्थी ने जांच अधिकारी की गलत व अनुचित रिपोर्ट के आधार पर प्राकृतिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों के विपरीत बर्खास्तगी की कार्यवाही अनुचित होना व दिया गया दण्ड अनुचित एवं गैर कानूनी मानते हुए पुनः सेवा में बहाली की मांग की गई है तथा पूर्व वेतन परिलाभो की भी मांग की है।

इसके विपरीत विपक्षी की ओर से उनके विद्वान अधिवक्ता श्री आर एस सोडाणी ने दि. 14-3-05 को जवाब प्रस्तुत करते हुए कथन किया है कि अप्रार्थी ने प्रार्थी को कभी धमकी नहीं दी थी तथा उसने प्रार्थी को कभी हीरालाल का नाम अपने कारण बताओ नोटिस के जवाब में बताने से नहीं रोका था। प्रार्थी ने स्वेच्छा कारण बताओ नोटिस का जवाब दिया था। कारण बताओ नोटिस का जवाब संतोषप्रद नहीं होने से ही प्रार्थी को दिनांक 23-6-98 द्वारा आदेश जारी कर विभागीय जांच कराने का निर्णय लिया गया था और प्रार्थी को इस दौरान निलंबित रखा गया था। प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध जांच निष्पक्ष अधिकारी के द्वारा की गई थी जिसमें प्रार्थी को बचाव का पर्याप्त अवसर दिया गया था। अप्रार्थी ने अपने जवाब के चरण सं. II में यह स्वीकार किया है कि उसने प्रार्थी को जांच रिपोर्ट की प्रति उपलब्ध नहीं कराई थी किन्तु केवल प्रति नहीं दिये

जाने से जांच कार्यवाही अनुचित नहीं हो जाती है ऐसा कथन विपक्षी ने अपने जवाब में किया है। प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध गंभीर और प्रमाणित आरोप थे और आरोपों के प्रभावित पाये जाने के आधार पर सेवा से बर्खास्त किया गया है। अंत में विपक्षी ने प्रार्थी के क्लेम को निरस्त करने की प्रार्थना की है।

मैंने पत्रावली का ध्यानपूर्वक अवलोकन किया और उभय पक्ष की बहस सुनी।

प्रार्थी ने अपनी बहस में मुख्य रूप से अपने स्टेटमेंट आफ क्लेम में वर्णित कथनों को दोहराया है जबकि विपक्षी ने अपनी ओर से प्रस्तुत जवाब के कथनों को दोहराया है।

प्रार्थी ने अपनी ओर से निम्न न्यायिक दृष्टांत प्रस्तुत किये हैं :—

1. 1994, सुप्रीम कोर्ट, एस.बी.आई. बनाम एस.के. एन्डो व अन्य 872
2. 2002, एल.आई.सी. स्वदेश काटन मिल्स लि. बनाम श्रम न्यायालय-4, उत्तर प्रदेश कानपुर, 1520
3. न्यायालय निर्णय श्रम विधान निर्णय सार पत्रिका वर्ष 2005, अंक जनवरी-फरवरी 2004।

जबकि विपक्षी की ओर से निम्न न्यायिक दृष्टांत प्रस्तुत किये गये हैं :—

1. 2001, (2) एल एल जे निखिल रंजन भौमिक बनाम त्रिपुरा ग्रामीण बैंक 755
2. 1998, सुप्रीम कोर्ट, यूनियन बैंक आफ इण्डिया बनाम विश्व मोहन
3. 2002 (3) एल एल जे देवतोष पाल चौधरी बनाम पंजाब नेशनल बैंक 250

मैंने उभय पक्ष द्वारा प्रस्तुत न्यायिक दृष्टांतों का ससम्मान अवलोकन कर लिया है।

इस न्यायालय को सर्वप्रथम यह निर्धारण करना है कि क्या विपक्षी ने अपनी जांच में आवश्यक नैसर्गिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों की पालना की है और प्रार्थी को सुनवाई का अवसर दिया है।

यह विवाद मुख्य रूप से दि. 9-6-98 को अप्रार्थी नियोजक की जीप संख्या 3208 को परिसर से बाहर ले जाकर दुर्घटनाग्रस्त करने व इसके परिणामस्वरूप रेलवे की दीवार तोड़ना तथा जीप में लगभग एक लाख रुपये का नुकसान होने से सम्बन्धित है। उपरोक्त दुर्घटना के परिणामस्वरूप नियोजक द्वारा प्रार्थी श्रमिक को एक कारण बताओ नोटिस दिनांक 10-6-98 को जारी किया गया था जिसमें उपरोक्त जीप के द्वारा दुर्घटना होना व उसमें प्रार्थी की गलती होना व तथा दुर्घटना के परिणामस्वरूप करीब एक लाख रुपये का नुकसान होना वर्णित किया है। उपरोक्त नोटिस में प्रार्थी को केवल 24 घण्टे का समय ही दिया गया था जिस बाबत अप्रार्थी ने कहीं कोई स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया था कि किस परिस्थितियों में श्रमिक को जवाब के लिये इतना कम समय दिया गया। विपक्षी के उपरोक्त नोटिस का जवाब प्रार्थी ने दिनांक 11-6-98 को दिया था। उपरोक्त नोटिस के जवाब के बाद नियोजक ने इस नोटिस के जवाब से असंतुष्ट होकर प्रार्थी को एक आरोपपत्र/निलम्बन आदेश दि. 23-6-98 जारी किया जिसके अवलोकन से यह कहीं स्पष्ट नहीं होता है कि प्रार्थी पर कौन से आरोप हैं जिस बाबत उसे निलंबित किया गया है जबकि आरोप पत्र में आरोपों का स्पष्ट उल्लेख किया जाना चाहिये। इस आरोप पत्र में राजेन्द्र सोलंकी को जांच अधिकारी नियुक्त किया गया है। इस आरोप पत्र/निलम्बन पत्र को देखने से प्रकट होता है कि यह आरोप पत्र और निलम्बन पत्र दोनों हैं जबकि इसके शीर्षक से दूसरा अर्थ निकलता है अर्थात् यह आरोप पत्र या निलम्बन पत्र है। इस

प्रकार अप्रार्थी का दिनांक 23-6-98 को जारी आरोप पत्र मेरी राय में त्रुटिपूर्ण है। इसी प्रकार से जांच कार्यवाही में जो कि दिनांक 28-7-98 की है प्रार्थी को अपनी ओर से बचाव के लिये प्रतिनिधि नियुक्त करने बाबत भी कोई अवसर नहीं दिया गया है और ना ही अप्रार्थी ने अपनी ओर से प्रार्थी को बचाव के लिये कोई अपील/नोटि देने का प्रस्ताव दिया है। जबकि नियोजक को अपने बचाव में प्रतिनिधि नियुक्त करने के लिये पृथक से लिखित में पत्र दिया जाना चाहिये था। जांच अधिकारी ने जांच रिपोर्ट की प्रति श्रमिक को उपलब्ध नहीं कराई है। यह बात स्वयं अप्रार्थी स्वीकार करते हैं। अप्रार्थी ने जिस रिपोर्ट के आधार पर अप्रार्थी को सेवा पृथक किया है वह दिनांक 10-9-98 का जारी है जो अपने आप में स्पीकिंग आदेश नहीं माना जा सकता है। इस सेवा पृथक्कीकरण आदेश में स्पष्ट है कि अनुशासनिक प्राधिकारी ने बिना मस्तिष्क का प्रयोग किये, बिना गुणावगुण पर विचार किये जांच रिपोर्ट को ही आधार बनाकर आदेश पारित किया है। प्रार्थी ने अपने क्लेम में अंकित किया है कि यह दुर्घटना वाहन चालक हीरालाल की गलती से हुई थी और उसके विरुद्ध जी.आर.पी. थाने में प्रथम सूचना रिपोर्ट भी दर्ज की गई थी और अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, रेलवे, अजमेर ने अपने निर्णय में उपरोक्त दुर्घटना बाबत वाहन चालक हीरालाल को ही दोषी मानकर सजा दी है। अप्रार्थी ने जांच अधिकारी के समक्ष हीरालाल के बयान भी नहीं करवाये हैं जिससे इस दुर्घटना बाबत जारी वस्तुस्थिति प्रकट नहीं हो सकी।

इस प्रकार उपरोक्त तथ्यों के आधार पर यह स्पष्ट है कि अप्रार्थी ने प्रार्थी के विरुद्ध की गई जांच में नैसर्गिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों की पालना नहीं की है। इस प्रकार अप्रार्थी द्वारा इस सम्बन्ध में दिया गया दण्डादेश निरस्तनीय है।

आदेश

फलतः प्रस्तुत विवाद का उत्तर इस प्रकार दिया जाता है कि कर्मकार कमल व्यास के विरुद्ध की गई घरेलू जांच नैसर्गिक न्याय के सिद्धांतों के विपरीत होने तथा अपचारी को सुनवाई का अवसर नहीं मिलने के कारण दोषपूर्ण थी अतः उक्त घरेलू जांच रिपोर्ट के आधार पर महाप्रबंधक मैसर्स उदयपुर मिनरल डेवलपमेंट सिंडीकेट प्रा. लि. भीलवाड़ा द्वारा कर्मकार श्री कमल व्यास को सहायक डीजल मेकेनिक के पद से दिनांक 10-9-98 को सेवा से बर्खास्त करना अनुचित एवं अवैध है अतः उक्त सेवा पृथक्कीकरण आदेश को अपास्त किया जाता है। प्रतिपक्षी घरेलू जांच अपने स्तर पर पुनः करने हेतु स्वतंत्र है और गत वेतन भत्ते के संबंध में नियमानुसार आदेश करने हेतु स्वतंत्र है।

अवार्ड की प्रति नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ केन्द्र सरकार को भिजवाई जावे।

अवार्ड आज दिनांक 3-8-05 को खुले न्यायालय में लिखवाया जाकर सुनाया गया।

गंगासिंह शेखावत, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3597.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हिन्दुस्तान कॉपर लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण धनबाद संख्या-1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 239/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-43011/1/2000-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. 3597.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 239/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 1 as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of Hindustan Copper Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-43011/1/2000-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a Reference U/s. 10(1)(d)(2A) of I.D. Act

Reference No. 239 of 2000

Perties : Employees in relation to the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

Present : Shri Sarju prasad, Presiding Officer

Appearances :

For the Employers : Shri D. K. Verma, Advocate.

For the Workman : Shri K. Chakravarty, Advocate

State : Jharkhand : Industry : Copper

Dated, the 12th August, 2005

AWARD

By Order No. L-43011/1/2000/IR(M) dated 22-8-2000 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-sec. (1) and sub-sec. (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the actions of management of Hindustan Copper Ltd., Ghatsila in calculating 45 days wages under Voluntary Retirement Scheme on the basis of dividing monthly emoluments by 30 instead of 26 days; And whether denial of arrears, DA, VDA, LTC, interim relief and other financial dues; And whether denial of compensation to workmen in accordance with Sec. 25FFF to the closure affected workmen of Pathatgora and Kendadih Mines who have opted for V.R.S. are fair, justified and legal? If not, to what relief concerned workmen are entitled to?"

2. On 11-8-2005 Shri K. Chakravarty, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the concerned workman submitted that the concerned workman is not interested to contest the case and also prayed for passing of a 'No Dispute' award.

3. In view of the prayer being made on behalf of the concerned workman, I render a 'No Dispute' award in this case.

SARJU PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 200

का. आ. 3598.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टोन इंटरनेशनल प्रा. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 44/2005 को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/76/2004-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. 3598.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 44/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of M/s. Stone International, Chechat, Teh. Ramganjmandi, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-29011/76/2004-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT, 44/2005

Refrence No. L-29011/76/2004-IR(M)

Sh. Ramesh Chandra,
S/o Sh. Dhanna Lal,
Through Secretary, Pathar Khan Kamgar Union,
H.M.S. Bengali Colony, Chhawani
Kota (Raj.)

... Applicant

Versus

The General Manager,
M/s. Stone International Chechat,
The. Ramgangmandi,
Distt. Kota (Raj.)

.... Non-applicant

Present :

Sh. R. C. Sharma, Presiding Officer

For the applicant : Sh. Arun Sharma

For the non-applicant : None

Date of award : 26-7-2005

AWARD

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 'D' of sub-sections 1 & 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') has referred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

"Whether the action of the General Manager, M/s. Stone International Pvt. Ltd. Lime Stone, Mine Owner, Chechat, Distt. Kota in terminating the services of workman Shri Ramesh Chandra S/o Dhanna Lal, Helper (Electrical) w.e.f. 19-7-2003 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The workman has pleaded in his claim statement that he was employed on 1-4-1989 as a helper on daily wages by the employer, who was confirmed vide letter dated 31-3-1993 and was promoted as a senior helper vide letter dated 20-7-1994 w.e.f. 1-7-1994. But he was declined to join the duties on 19-7-2003. He has stated that from 1-4-1989 to 18-7-2003 he had continuously worked over 240 days in a calendar year, whose service was terminated in violation of Section 25-F of the Act. He has also added that no seniority list was prepared by the employer as per rules and at the time of terminating his service the junior employees Chandrabhan and Vasant Kumar were retained by the management. He has urged to reinstate him with full back-wages.

3. On 6-6-2005, at the stage of filing the written statement, the ex-parte proceeding was drawn against the non-applicant, on whose behalf none appeared before the Court despite the service of the registered notice.

4. In the ex-parte evidence, the workman has submitted his affidavit and four documents in support of his submission.

5. I have heard the Id. representative for the workman and have gone through the record.

6. The workman Ramesh Chandra, in his affidavit, has deposed that he was employed as a helper on 1-4-1989 by the employer in whose favour the certificate (Ex. W-1) was issued by the employer and was confirmed by the order dated 31-3-1993. His submission is that w.e.f. 1-7-1994 he was promoted as the senior helper (electrical). But he was declined to join the duty w.e.f. 19-7-2003.

7. The statement of the workman is fortified from his appointment letter Ex. W-2 dated 31-3-1993 whereby he was appointed as helper w.e.f. 1-4-1993. The certificate Ex. W-1 dated 28-7-1998 has also been issued by the manager (mines) stating that he is working as a helper w.e.f. 1-4-1989 and further his statement is also supported by the promotion order dated 20-7-1994 whereby he was promoted as a senior helper w.e.f. 1-7-1994. The workman has claimed in his affidavit that he continuously worked from 1-4-1989 to 18-7-2003. His submission is also corroborated by the documentary evidence Ex. W1 to W3 which indicate that he was in continuous employment from 1-4-1989 to 28-7-1998 and has completed over 240 days in

the each calendar year in this duration. His statement on this point stands corroborated and his termination from service is found to be in violation of Section 25-F of the Act.

8. So far as the violation of the provision under Section 25-G of the Act is concerned, the workman in his affidavit has named Vasant Kumar, Chandrabhan and Kailash Joshi, the junior employees who were retained by the employer while his service was terminated. But on this point, only the oral evidence of the workman is available on record and no other corroborating oral evidence or documentary evidence could be brought on the record. Therefore, the workman has not succeeded to prove that the junior persons to him were retained by the management in violation of Section 25-G of the Act.

9. On conclusion, the workman has succeeded to prove that his service was terminated in violation of Section 25-F of the Act. He has also stated that since the date of his termination i.e. 19-7-2003 he is unemployed till date. Accordingly, the workman is entitled for the reinstatement.

10. Consequently, the reference is answered in affirmative in favour of the workman and it is held that the termination order dated 19-7-2003 passed by the non-applicant management is illegal and unjustified. The claim of the workman is allowed and it is held that he is entitled to be reinstated in the service with its continuity and 50% backwages. An award is passed in these terms accordingly.

11. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3599.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हिन्दुस्तान कॉपर लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 24/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-9-05 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/52/2002-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2005

S.O. 3599.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 24/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-29011/52/2002-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
CUM LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT-24/2003.

Reference No. L-29011/52/2002-IR(M)

The General Secretary,
Rashtriya Copper Mazdoor Congress (INTUC),
Distt. Jhunjhunu (Raj.),
Khetri, Rajasthan ... Applicant-union

Versus

The Executive Director,
Hindustan Copper Ltd. KCC,
Khetri Nagar,
Dt. Jhunjhunu
Jhunjhunu. Non-applicant

PRESENT:

Presiding Officer : Sh. R. C. Sharma.
For the applicant : Sh. Rajendra Arora.
For the non-applicant : Sh. Manoj Sharma &
Sh. Rajeev Sharma
Date of award : 18-8-2005

AWARD

The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 'D' of sub-sections 1 & 2(A) to Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') has referred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

“क्या प्रबंधन हिन्दुस्थान कॉपर लि., खेतड़ी कार्पे कॉम्प्लैक्स द्वारा कर्मचारी श्री ईश्वर दयाल जैसवाल को वरिष्ठता सूची सन् 1989 के अनुसार दिनांक 29-5-1995 से सेवा में नियमित किया जाना उचित है? अगर नहीं, तो कर्मचारी किस लाभ का हकदार है और किस तिथि से?”

2. The applicant-union has pleaded in its claim statement that its member the workman Sh. Iswar Dayal Jaswal is working with the non-applicant establishment whose service was regularized w.e.f. 29-5-95, who had also been earlier employed in the establishment in two spells in the years 1976 and 1977 respectively and had completed 67 working days as a casual labourer during this period. The work experience certificates were also issued in his favour by the management authorities. The Union has further stated that a pool was constituted as per the Bipartite Settlement (for short, BPS) dated 17-4-78 whereby it was resolved that the employees who had completed a minimum period of 60 days of work as casual labourer would be enlisted and they would be kept in the pool. In furtherance of it, the list Ex. 4 was prepared by the management, but the workman's name was not included therein despite the fact that he had completed 67 days as a casual worker. As per the another BPS dated 21-3-79 entered into between the concerned parties, the number of working days was reduced to 50 instead of 60 and a seniority list in accordance with it was issued on 20-4-79 wherein too the name of workman was missing and the workman had submitted two representations Ex. W-6 and W-7 before the authorities. It is further alleged that the

services of the junior persons to the workman, viz., Laxman, Dharampal, Arjun, Ambey Lal and Beban Singh have been regularized and feeling aggrieved with it, the workman again submitted his representations Ex. W-8 to W-14 before the concerned authorities. The Union has urged that the workman is entitled for his regularization w.e.f. 1979 as a regular employee who had completed 60 days of work between March, 1976 to August, 1978, whereas he was regularized w.e.f. 29-5-95 contrary to the provisions of the BPS dated 17-4-78 and the Act.

3. Resisting the claim, the non-applicant in his written-counter has averred that the dispute has been raised belatedly after a lapse of 23 years and that it does not fall under the definition of the industrial dispute. The non-applicant has further pleaded that the workman had discharged his duties between March, 1976 to August, 1978 for less than 50 days, that the certificates Ex. W-1 to W-3 have not been issued by the competent authorities and has admitted that a seniority list as per the BPS dated 17-4-78 was prepared, but has contended that the workman never worked more than 60 days in the said period. He has also added that the workman had never protested within the prescribed period of 15 days since the publication of the seniority list. The non-applicant has also stated that the workman's name was not included in the another seniority list dated 20-4-79 as he had not completed 50 days of work and no objection thereto was raised before the concerned authorities. But taking a lenient view towards the workman his name was included in the seniority list issued in the year 1989 and his service was regularized w.e.f. 1995 along with the other casual labourers, for which the workman had no legal right.

4. In the rejoinder, the Union has reiterated the facts as stated in its statement of claim.

5. On the pleadings of both the parties, the following points for determination were framed :

- I. Whether the applicant-workman is entitled for regularization w.e.f. the year 1979 inasmuch as he had completed over 60 days during the period from March, 1976 to August, 1978? BOA
- II. Whether the present dispute is not an industrial dispute on the ground that it has been raised after a lapse of 22 years? BONA
- III. Whether the dispute in question neither ever existed nor is existing between the workman and the employer? BONA
- IV. Relief, if any.

6. In the evidence, the Union has examined Iswar Dayal Jaswal as WW-1 and in the rebuttal, the counter-affidavit of MW-1, Chhaju Ram, Sr. Personnel Officer has been placed on the record. Both these witnesses were cross-examined by the respective opposite representative.

7. I have heard both the parties and have scanned the record. The point-wise discussion follows as under :—

Point No. I

8. The Id. representative for the workman contends that as per the BPS dated 17-4-78, the labourers who have completed 60 days with the non-applicant from March,

1976 to August, 1978, were to be absorbed by the management and the workman had completed 64 days, but his name was not included in the seniority list. The Id. representative has further contended that this period of 60 days was further reduced by a minimum period of 50 days vide BPS dated 21-3-79 and the seniority list was published which also did not include the name of the workman. According to the submission of the Id. representative, the workman had completed 64 days on the basis of the certificates Ex. 1 to Ex. 3, who made several representations before the management to include his name but no attention was paid to it. His further submission is that the workman has reaffirmed in his cross-examination that he had submitted the representations within the prescribed time to include his name in the seniority list, which were not replied.

9. Per contra, the Id. representative for the non-applicant contends that as per the BPS dated 17-4-78, the workman were required to file the protest petition within 15 days, but during this period workman raised no objection before the management, who had neither completed 60 days nor 50 days during the said period, but taking a lenient view towards him his name was included in the 3rd seniority list issued in the year 1989. The Id. representative disputing the genuineness of the certificates Ex. W1 to W-3 has submitted that these were not issued by the establishment and on the basis of the record produced by the establishment the workman had completed only 24 days in the said period.

10. I have bestowed my anxious consideration to the rival contentions.

11. Now, the first and foremost question which crops up for consideration is whether the workman had completed a minimum period of 60 working days between March, 1976 to August, 1978?

12. It appears from the perusal of the record that the BPS dated 17-4-78 has not been placed on the record, but Ex. M-3, the minutes of the meeting held on 21-3-79 between the representatives of the management and Khetri Copper Mazdoor Sangh discloses that the workman who had worked for a minimum period of 60 days or more during the period between March, 1976 to August, 1978 were enlisted in accordance with the BPS dated 17-4-78. However, there is no dispute on this factual aspect.

13. The workman to substantiate his plea of completion of minimum period of 60 working days has placed his reliance on the certificates Ex. W-1 and W-2 and the chart Ex. W-3. Ex. W-1 is the work experience certificate dated 27-1-86 which says that the workman had worked in the refinery plant from 26-8-76 to 7-10-76 for 35 days as a casual labour. Ex. W-2 is the certificate of attendance, which states that the workman had worked from 26-4-77 to 10-5-77 and 11-5-77 to 16-5-77 for 20 days in total. Ex. W-3 is the chart of employment of the workmen during the course of safety arrangement and it indicates that the disputant had worked with the non-applicant company for 9 days. Thus with the assistance of these three documents, the workman has pleaded that he had completed 64 days during the period in question.

14. In his cross-examination, the workman has deposed that these certificates have been issued by Sh. K.C. Rawat, the Assistant manager and Sh. P. Swaroop, the Deputy Manager respectively. MW-1, Chhaju Ram although have disputed the genuineness of these documents in his affidavit by stating that these documents have not been issued by any competent authority of the company, but in his cross-examination, he has admitted that Ex. W-1 has been issued by the site in-charge and Ex. W-2 has been issued on behalf of the establishment. He has further admitted that Ex. W-3 bears the seal of the establishment. Therefore, the genuineness of these documents cannot be doubted and the workman has emphatically deposed that these were issued on behalf of the management, which has been admitted by the management witness also. On the strength of these documents, the workman has been able to satisfy the Court that during the period in question he had completed 64 days in total and had qualified the requirement laid down by the BPS dated 17-4-78.

15. As against it on behalf of the management is has been disputed that the workman had completed the minimum period of 60 working days in the aforesaid duration. To rebut the plea of the workman, the management has placed his reliance upon the documents produced by it before the court. In the cross-examination, MW-1, Chhaju Ram has stated that the appointment letter was issued to the workman, but the copy of it has not been placed on the record. To a question, he has replied that the attendance register of the workman was maintained in the plant, where he was employed and which has been produced before the Court. But this witness felt uncomfortable when he was asked to point out the number of working days performed by the workman. Thus, the management has failed to rebut the plea of the workman that he had completed 64 working days during the period in question and on account of the aforesaid analysis of the evidence adduced by both the parties on the record, documentary as well as oral, the workman has succeeded to establish that he had worked for a minimum period of 60 days between March, 1976 to August, 1978. Thus, he satisfies the requirement laid down by the BPS dated 17-4-78.

16. It has been alleged on behalf of the management that the workman had not protested before the concerned authority within the prescribed period of 15 days since the publication of the seniority list, which has been sought to be controverted on behalf of the workman by stating that he had submitted the representation Ex. W-6 with regard to the BPS dated 17-4-78 for not enrolling his name in the seniority list and after the publication of the seniority list Ex. W-4 and W-5, he has raised the objection for excluding his name by his representation Ex. W-7 dated 27-6-80.

17. Ex. W-4 is the seniority list dated 15-11-78 and the seniority list Ex. M-2 relied upon by the management is identical to the seniority list Ex. W-4. Similarly, the seniority list Ex. W-5 dated 20-4-79 is identical to the seniority list Ex. M-4. Ex. W-6 is the letter dated 27-6-80 addressed by the workman to the Personnel Officer to consider his case for enrolment of his name in the seniority

list. Thus, it appears that after the issuance of the seniority list Ex. W-4 on 15-11-78 and thereafter the another seniority list Ex. W-5 on 20-4-79, the workman had submitted his representation on 27-6-80 before the competent authority. Though his first representation Ex. W-6 was addressed on 27-6-80 before the management after issuance of the seniority list Ex. W-5 on 20-4-79 pursuant to the second BPS dated 21-3-79, yet looking to this factual aspect that evidently on the strength of the documents Ex. W-1 to Ex. W-3, which pertain to the management, the workman had completed over 60 working days between March, 1976 to August, 1978 and qualifies the required condition for claiming his seniority, the delay occasioned in filing his protest petition Ex. W-6 within 15 days may be overlooked.

18. On the aforesaid analytical examination of the facts available on the record, the workman has succeeded to discharge the onus of point number I, which is accordingly decided in his favour.

Point No. II & III

19. Since the facts involved in both these points are identical, they are being discussed together hereunder.

20. The Ld. representative for the non-applicant contends that the workman has raised the dispute after a lapse of 23 years, therefore, it is not an industrial dispute and he has not shown any ground for raising the dispute at such a belated stage. The Ld. representative in support of his submission has placed his reliance upon (2002) 10 SCC 703 and 1998 (78) Allahabad 511. Contrary to it, the Ld. representative for the workman contends that the workman by his representations from Ex. W-6 to W-15 had taken up this issue with the management way back in the 1978 onwards and he continued to represent. His submission is that only on the sole ground of delay the relief sought by the workman cannot be denied to him and the Ld. representative has drawn my attention towards 2001 (90) FLR SC 754.

21. Now, the question which emerges for consideration is whether on the sole ground of delay caused in raising the industrial dispute, the relief sought by the workman can be denied to him or the dispute cannot be termed as an industrial dispute.

22. It appears that after a lapse of nearly 22 years, the workman had raised the industrial dispute and it has been shown on his behalf that he had continuously represented before the management. The workman has placed his reliance on his representations from Ex. W-6 to W-15. On a look at these representations, it is obvious that they were addressed to the management on various dates commencing from the year 1980 till the end of 2001, viz., on 27-6-80, 2-7-81, 10-1-82, 2-7-85, 13-1-86, 15-2-86, 25-11-87, 27-11-88, 25-11-97, 26-5-98, 8-9-99, 2-7-2001 and ultimately on 7-11-2001. As such, the workman was consistently striving for the claim of his regularization.

23. The Ld. representative for the non-applicant has referred to (2002) 10 SCC 703, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has denied the relief to the petitioner on the ground that there has been inordinate and unexplained delay of five years. On the other hand, the Ld. representative for

the workman has placed his reliance upon 2001(90) FLR SC 754, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that when the Government has chosen the dispute for adjudication the reference should not be quashed merely on the ground of delay and if the dispute existed on the day when the reference was made by the Government, it is idle to ascertain the number of years. Therefore, simply on the ground of delay in raising the industrial dispute the relief to the workman cannot be declined and the submission put forward on behalf of the workman finds assistance from the decision referred to, where as the facts of (2002) 10 SCC 703 relied upon by the management are dissimilar to the present controversy.

24. In the light of the principle propounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the contention advanced on behalf of the non-applicant cannot be maintained and both these points are decided against him.

25. For the foregoing reasons, the applicant union has succeeded to establish its claim.

26. In consequence, the reference is answered in the affirmative in favour of the Union and against the non-applicant and it is held that the action of the management in regularizing the service of the workman in accordance with the seniority list 1989 is unjustified and the workman is entitled to be entited in the seniority list Ex. W-4 dated 15-11-78 and to get service regularized from the date of services of his juniors were regularized. An award is passed in these terms accordingly.

27. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3600.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूनाइटेड इंडिया इश्योरेंस कं. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 164/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-17012/53/97-आई आर (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3600.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 164/98) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure is in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of United India Insurance Co. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-17012/53/97-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SRISURESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING
OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM AND LABOUR COURT
SARVODAYA NAGAR, KANPUR, U.P.**

Industrial Dispute No. 164 of 98

In the matter of Dispute between:

Sh. R. N. Arora, Unit Secretary,
General Insurance Association,
117/K-36 Sarvodaya Nagar,
Kanpur.

AND

The Regional Manager,
United India Insurance Company Ltd.,
Arif Chamber, 3rd Floor,
Kapurthala Complex,
Aliganj, Lucknow

AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, vide notification No. L-17012/53/97/IR(B-II) dated 19-8-98, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of United India Insurance Co. Ltd. in not adding service period of Sri S.N. Tripathi for the period between 27-11-81 to 16-6-85, is justified if not to what relief the said workman is entitled?”

2. It is admitted case of the parties that the workman concerned Sri S. N. Tripathi was placed under suspension vide order dtd. 27-11-81 thereafter he was served with a chargesheet dated 1-6-82 and also supplementary chargesheet was served on him on 18-10-82. The disciplinary authority passed its final order on 12-6-85, whereafter the workman joined his duties as Assistant w.e.f. 17-6-85. Worker preferred an appeal which was decided by the appellate authority vide order dtd. 30-9-87.

3. In the above backdrop the workman has alleged that he was not afforded with an opportunity of his defence in the departmental inquiry and thus the whole action in name of disciplinary action is nothing but an eye wash of the management. Denial of opportunity to defend his case has rendered the entire action as vitiated. On the basis of above it has been prayed that the punishment order and appellate order be declared as null and void and the workman be allowed to be treated on duty during the period he remained under suspension.

4. The claim of the workman has been contested by the opposite party management. It has been alleged by the opposite party that the appellate authority has not treated the workman on duty during the period 27-11-81 to 16-6-86, thus this period cannot be termed to be the suspension period and on this ground alone reference

order is bad in law. It is also alleged that the workman moved an application under Section 33-C-2 of the Act, before this tribunal claiming wages during the period he remained under suspension. The said claim of the applicant was rejected by the tribunal. The tribunal in its order has not held that the order of the appellate authority was erroneous or suffers from infirmity. Writ petition filed by the workman against the order of the tribunal before the High Court at Allahabad also could not find favour to the applicant/workman therefore principle of ‘Estoppel’ & ‘Resjudicata’ comes into play in the present case, therefore, the reference is bad in law. Since the punishment order as well as appellate order dtd. 30-9-87 whereby it has been ordered that the period between 27-11-81 to 16-6-85 shall not be treated as spent of duty by the workman and this punishment has not so far been disturbed by any competent court of law hence the action of the management is perfectly legal and does not suffers from any infirmity.

5. After exchange of pleadings between the parties, contesting parties have also filed documentary evidence in support of their respective cases and oral evidence has also been lead by the parties in the case.

6. From the admitted case of the parties it is clear that the punishment awarded to the workman has been modified by the appellate authority wherein it has been held that the period of suspension of the workman shall not be treated to be spent on duty. It therefore follows that the punishment awarded to the workman to the extent that the period of suspension shall not be treated as period spent on duty has been upheld by the appellate authority in its order dated 30-9-87. It is also clear from the pleadings of the parties that the workman moved under Section 33-C-2 of the Act claim wages for the said period which has been decided by the court against him and that the writ petition against that order of the Labour Court too has been dismissed by the Hon’ble High Court. These facts have not been denied by the workman either in his evidence or in his pleadings. It is settled principle of law that once a matter has been decided between the parties by competent court of law it is not open to either party to raise the said dispute again. In view of it once the order of the appellate authority has been confirmed by the Labour Court and also by the Hon’ble High Court of Judicature at Allahabad as is clear from the pleadings of the opposite party which has not specifically been denied by the workman it is not open for the workman to raise said issue again by invoking jurisdiction of Section 10(1) of the I.D. Act, 1947, and the schedule of reference order appears to be misconcieved and is liable to be rejected as the same is bad in law.

7. In view of above discussions, the claim of the workman is not maintainable and the workman is not entitled for any relief pursuant to the reference made to this Tribunal. Accordingly it is held that the workman is not entitled for any relief and the reference is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

SURESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3601.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इण्डियन ऑयल कॉर्पो. लि. के प्रबंधांत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चंडीगढ़ संख्या-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 48/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-30012/23/2004-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3601.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 48/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh No. II as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Indian Oil Corpn. Ltd., Panipat Refinery Project and their workman, received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-30012/23/2004-IR (M)]

C. GANGADHRAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT-II, H. NO. 1228, SECTOR-24-B,
CHANDIGARH**

PRESIDING OFFICER:

Shri Kuldip Singh

Case I. D. No. 48/2004

Registered on 29-11-2004

Date of Decision 5-9-2005

Shri Ram Mehar Sharma
S/o Sh. Lakhi Ram
Village Munak, P.O. Munak,
Teh. Gharaunda, Karnal.

.... Petitioner

V/s

The Executive Director,
Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.,
Panipat Refinery Project,
Baholi, Panipat-132140

..... Respondents

APPEARANCES

For the workman : Workman is present through
his representative.
For the Management : S. Kaushal &
Associates, Advocates

AWARD

Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide its
notification No. L-30012/23/2004-IR (M) datd 7th of

November 2004 referred the following dispute for the
adjudication of this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court :

"Whether the action of the management of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Panipat Refinery in terminating the services of Sh. Ram Mehar Sharma S/o. Sh. Lakhi Ram, helper Gr.-I w.e.f. 1/3/2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

Upon the receipt of the reference the notice thereof was issued to the parties. The workman appeared through Sh. Karan Singh Rana, his representative whereas the Management appeared through their Advocate S. Kaushal & Associates.

The workman filed his claim petition on 8th of February 2005 to which the Management filed the written statement on 28th of April 2005. Thereafter the workman was given permission to file rejoinder, but neither the workman appeared nor filed the same. Representative of workman Sh. Karan Singh, stated that the workman is no more interested in these proceedings. Since I did not find the letter of authority given by the workman, to the so called representative of the workman, therefore, I directed that a notice be issued to the workman. Despite that he did not appear. He, however, appeared on 1st of August, 2005 to file rejoinder, a copy which was provided to the Management. He, was directed to provide copies of the documents, filed by him with the rejoinder, to the Management. The parties were also directed to file affidavits in the case today, but neither they are present in person nor the Management present through their counsel. However, Sh. Karan Singh Rana representative appearing for the workman, stated on oath, that the workman has got a better job, therefore, he is not interested in prosecuting this case. The appearance of workman on 1st of August 2005 has given me reason to believe that the workman was duly served with the notice for appearing in the Court and therefore he was well aware of pendency of his petition before this Court.

The reference, pending consideration of this Tribunal, is to find out whether the action of the Management of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Panipat Refinery, in terminating the services of Sh. Ram Mehar Sharma S/o Sh. Lakhi Ram resident of Village Munak, Teh. Gharaunda, Karnal was just and legal.

The workman in his claim petition submitted that he was appointed as helper Grade-I, in Power and Utility Department where he worked under the respondent, from 1st of January 1999 till 1st of March 2001, on a monthly salary of Rs. 1910. He has further claimed that the Management was having full control over his working. He was given jobs from time to time and the officers of the Management supervised his work, that on 1st of March 2001 the Management suddenly changed their mind, that he had worked continuously for 240 days, but at the time of termination of his services, the Management in violation of provisions of Industrial Dispute Act, terminated his services without a notice to the appropriate authority. They also did not follow the directions of law; that the action of the Management in terminating the services of the workman

was highly arbitrary, illegal and wrongful. No inquiry was held against him nor he was served with any chargesheet. The workman in the end, has prayed for declaring the termination of his services as illegal, wrongful and unjust.

The Management filed their written statement on 28th of April 2004 and has raised the objections that the claim of the workman is not maintainable since there existed no relationship of master and servant between them; that in the face of Contract labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, the matter of abolition of contract cannot be looked into a reference made under the Industrial Dispute Act. On facts they have challenged the claim of the workman that he was ever employed by the Management. According to them the appointments of workmen were covered by set procedure and the rules. Giving the detail of procedure, followed in making the appointments, they have submitted that the workman did not submit himself to the said procedure and so he was never employed by the Management. According to them the workman was engaged by Prakash Construction, Panipat. They have further denied that the work of workman was ever supervised by the officers of Management. However, the employees engaged by the contractor of the Management, were supposed to be under the control of all the supervising officers of the Management. It was the contractor who assigned work to the applicant and it was he who was paying wages to the applicant. The Management made no payments. There was also never an occasion or reason to dispense with the services of the applicant as he was never in the employment of the Management. It is also wrong to claim that he had served the Management for 240 days. Admitting that the Management is an industry, they have denied that the applicant was ever in the employment of Management or that his services were terminated by them. Giving the same reason for denying the claim of payment of wages by the Management, it is submitted by them that there never existed the relationship of master and servant between the parties.

From the pleading of the parties it emerges out that there is denial of existence of relationship of employer and employee between the parties. The workman filed rejoinder and reiterated the facts stated in the claim petition. He also attached copies of the some documents in support of his claim.

As per the record, the workman has stopped coming to the court and according to his representative he has joined a new job, therefore, he is not interested to follow his claim in this Court. Thus the facts stated in the claim petition and rejoinder are not supported by any evidence except by his own affidavit. The Management has denied all the claims so made. Therefore, there is no proof to support the plea that whatever is claimed by the workman is correct. In the circumstances there is no evidents on record to show that the action of the Management of Indian Oil Corporation, Panipat Refinery, in terminating the services of Shri. Ram Mohan Sharma S/o Shri. Lalji Ram, Vill. Munak, P.O. Munak, Teh. Gharaunda, helper Grade-I, w.e.f. 1st of March 2001 was not just and legal. The workman is, therefore, not entitled to any relief, as is claimed by him.

The reference is answered in these terms. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action and the file consigned to records after due completion.

KULDIP SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3602.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या एलसीआईडी-248/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40025/6/2005-आई आर (डीयू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3602.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. LCID-248/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-40025/6/2005-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**

Present :

Shri T. Ramachandra Reddy,
Presiding Officer

Dated the 31st August, 2005

Industrial Dispute L.C.D. No. 248/2001

BETWEEN:

Smt. Hameeda Begum,
W/o Abdul Ali.

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Chief General Manager,
Telecom A.P. Circle,
Nampally Road, Abids,
Hyderabad.
2. The President,
A.P. Telecom Circle Welfare Board,
C/o A.P. Telecom Officer,
Abids, Nampally Road, Hyderabad.

3. The Secretary,
Telecom Womens' Association,
A.P. Telecom Circle Office,
Abids, Namapally Road,
Hyderabad.

Respondents

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : Ch. Indrasena Reddy, Advocate
For the Respondent : R. S. Murthy & Associates,
Advocate

AWARD

This is a case taken under Sec. 2 A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 in view of the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh reported in W.P. No. 8395 of 1989 dated 3-8-1995 between Sri U. Chinnappa and M/s. Cotton Corporation of India and two others.

2. This is a claim application filed by the applicant Smt. Ameeda Begum against the Chief General Manager, Telecom, A.P. circle as R1, the President, A.P. Telecom as R2 and the Secretary, Telecom Womens Association as R3 on the file of Labour Court-I at Hyderabad which was taken on file as ID. 140/99. The same was transferred to this Tribunal on the point of jurisdiction after constitution of this Tribunal.

3. The averments made in the claim application are as follows : That the applicant joined the service of Telecom Department on 14-8-1984 as Tailor Worker and served with unblemished record till she was terminated from service on 1-5-1997. She worked in a Tailoring Centre at GPO premises, Abids, Hyderabad and her post was carrying the pay scale of Rs. 950/- to Rs. 1200/- whereas she was paid only a pay of Rs. 950/- per month. She served continuously for 13 years and requested the management to regularize her service and also filed the OA. 1374 of 1996 on 22-11-1996 before the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal claiming regularisation of her service. But the management terminated her services instead of regularizing her service. She further, stated that she has withdrawn the said OA before CAT protecting her right to move the proper legal forum. She moved the Labour department. But her dispute was not settled and her juniors were retained in service. The management has closed the Tailoring Centre without obtaining prior permission from the competent authority and retrenched her service and failed to issue 3 months notice or pay in lieu of the notice. She requested to set aside the termination order and direct the management to reinstate with back wages and continuity of service.

4. The 3rd respondent filed the counter through the K. Jayamala and the respondents 1 & 2 filed a memo adopting the same.

5. The respondent contended that the industrial dispute is not maintainable either in law or on facts and that the petitioner was working as a part time employee at the rate of 2 hours a day at two different places located at Ashman Mahal and Vasant Vihar buildings. She was working alternatively at both the places between 12 am to 2 pm for the benefits of the housewives residing in the residential quarters. It is admitted that the petitioner was engaged in

the 1984 year and she was being paid Rs. 600 + Rs. 350 per month as honorarium and the 3rd respondent used to get grants from the 2nd respondent. It is further, submitted that every woman employee at the first respondent circle office will become a member by contributing Rs. 10 per annum as subscription. The elections of the 3rd respondent will be held in once in two years. The Executive committee of the association will be deciding the activities and programmes depending upon the availability of funds. The first respondent is the Ex-Officio present of the second respondent circle welfare board. The central welfare board at New Delhi will be allocating funds of the 2nd respondent welfare board to look after the welfare activities and used to allocate some funds to 3rd respondent.

6. It is further submitted that the 3rd respondent association decided to close the Tailoring Centre due to poor patronize on the part of its members w.e.f. 1-5-1997 and the 3rd respondent accordingly served notice on the petitioner on 12-6-1997, stating that her services are not required and also paid an amount of Rs. 950 as honorarium for one month pay in lieu of notice. It is further submitted that a cheque for Rs. 3325 towards payment of May, April and June and one month notice period was sent and the same was realized by the petitioner and further submitted that the 3rd respondent has offered to pay due compensation to the petitioner. However, she did not made any representation. It is further submitted that the petitioner was the only lady worker and none were employed in her place thereafter. She never worked in the first respondent. The pay scales referred by the petitioner belongs to the cadre of Telecom Department and that she is not the worker of the Telecom Department and she was only employed by the association on part time basis by paying honorarium.

7. The petitioner filed here affidavit in support of her case as WW1 and got marked the documents as Exs. W1 to W13. The respondent filed an affidavit of Smt. K. Jayamala and reiterated the averments made in her counter and contended that the women employees have nominated a Secretary among themselves to monitor the welfare activities and keep a liason with the departmental officer and further submitted that the welfare grants provided by the department are utilized for the welfare of the employees of the department. The said grants are considered by the department through a board of officers and the said board is purely internal arrangement and no separate entity and further submitted that the first respondent has no concern with the women employees association expect to provide funds by the way of welfare grant depending upon the necessity of each case. It is further submitted that the petitioner was engaged as an Instructor for giving coaching in Tailoring at the two centres and both the centres were closed as the employees did not evince any interest.

8. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was engaged as a tailoring instructor since 14-8-1984 and she was terminated w.e.f. 15-6-1997 by issuing notice dt. 12-6-1997 by paying one month pay in lieu of notice. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner was worked as a Tailoring Instructor under 3rd respondent association. It is also not

in dispute that the 3rd respondent formed the association by the women members and run tailoring centres by the subscription collected from the members and also the grant received from the first respondent. It is also not in dispute that the tailoring centres were closed for want of patronize and availability of funds.

9. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that the association is the workman within the definition under ID Act under first respondent department and worked for about 13 years and that her services were retrenched without following the procedure under section 25(N) of the ID Act, as such she is entitled for reinstatement with backwages.

10. On the other hand, the Learned Counsel for the respondent vehemently contended firstly that without there being any reference under section 10 is not maintainable since the Central Government is the appropriate Government for the Central Government undertakings and further contended that state amendment to ID Act permitting the workmen to approach directly as no application with regard to the dispute relating to Central Government undertaking i.e. BSNL and further contended that the petitioner is not a workman for the purpose of ID Act as she was engaged by paying only honorarium for working 2 hours in a day as a part time job and further contended that the women employees of telecom association i.e. 3rd respondent association is purely a private association has no nexus to the BSNL except the premises have been provided for coaching and further contended tailoring centres were running with the payment made by the association or from their own resources and sometimes by the welfare funds provided by the first respondent and further contended that no person was engaged or retained after closure of the coaching centre and that the juniors of the petitioner were retained is incorrect and further contended that a pass was provided to the petitioner to prevent entry of unauthorized persons to the premises of the coaching centre located in the residential quarters of the employees.

11. In view of the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh reported in WP. 8395 of 1989 dated 3-8-1995 between Sri U. Chinnappa and M/s. Cotton Corporation of India and two others, the workmen of the industry can directly approach this Tribunal when his services were terminated or disengaged by the management of the industry irrespective of the fact that appropriate Government is the State or Central Government without a reference under section 10 of ID Act. It has to be seen whether the petitioner is the workman of the Telecom Department, admittedly she was engaged by the respondent No. 3 association and this association is formed by inducting women members of the employees by collecting subscriptions. The association is running its activities with its own resources and welfare grants provided by the first respondent on sometimes. It has got its own Executive Committee supervising the welfare activities of the association. Merely because the first respondent has provided premises for conducting welfare activities of the 3rd respondent association, it cannot be said that the 3rd respondent is the Telecom Department. There is no evidence

on record to show that the petitioner is a workman of the first respondent management. It should be noted that there is no nexus between the first respondent and 3rd respondent association and the activities of the 3rd respondent are supervised by the elected body of the association and therefore it can not be said that the petitioner is the workman under the Industrial Disputes Act. The 3rd respondent did not come under the purview of industry or muchless public sector undertaking and it is purely an association. Therefore, this ID is not maintainable.

12. It should be noted that the petitioner has worked for about 13 years under the 3rd respondent with a meagre salary of Rs. 950/- per month and she was paid only one month pay in lieu of the notice and further she is litigating since for the last about 6 years with a fond hope of getting job or compensation. The respondent No. 3 has offered in para-5 to pay due compensation to the petitioner but pleaded that the petitioner did not make any representation. Every employee having worked for considerable period expects retirement benefits or compensation. In view of the offer made by the 3rd respondent, I feel that the petitioner should be awarded reasonable compensation. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, a consolidated amount of Rs. 15000 shall be paid to the petitioner in full and final settlement of the claim of the petitioner. Therefore, an award is passed directing the 3rd respondent to pay the said amount of Rs. 15000 within one month from the date of notification of award failing which the petitioner is entitled to claim interest at the rate of 6 % per annum. The ID is disposed of accordingly.

Dictated to Shri P. Kanaka Raju, LDC transcribed by him, corrected by me and pronounced in the open court on this the 31st of August, 2005.

T. RAMACHANDRA REDDY, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
WW1	MW1

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex W1:	The representation Lr. to Asst. General Manager dt. 8-2-93.
Ex W2:	The postal receipt.
Ex W3:	The representation Lr. to Chief General Manager dt. 15-3-93.
Ex W4:	The representation for payment of arrears to the CGM, Telecom.
Ex W5:	The representation for encashment of salary.
Ex W6:	The explanation letter to the CGM.
Ex W7:	The representation Lr. to the CGM, Telecom dt. 14-5-1997.
Ex W8:	The Lr. of Asst. Director to me dt. 19-6-97.
Ex W9:	The representation to the RLC(C), Hyderabad dt. 1-4-98.

- Ex.W 10 : The notice from the ALC(C) dt. 21-7-98.
 Ex.W 11 : The conciliation report of the ALC(C) to the RLC(C).
 Ex.W 12 : The representation of the petitioner to the RLC(C) dt. 18-11-1998 with ack.
 Ex.W 13 : Original ID card.

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3603.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयर फोर्स स्टेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या एलसीआईडी-164/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14025/3/2005-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3603.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. LCID-164/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Air Force Station and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-14025/3/2005-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**

PRESENT:

Shri T. Ramachandra Reddy, Presiding Officer

Dated the 17th August, 2005

Industrial Dispute L.C.L.D. No. 164/2003

Between :

Bonigala Vijaya Kumar,
S/o Mohan Rao, Hyderpet Village,
Nallamothuvaripalem Post,
Bapatla Mandal, Guntur Dist.

.....Petitioner

And

1. The Station Commander,
M/s. Air-Force Station,
Suryalanka,
Near Bapatla,
Guntur Dist.

2. The Southern Air Commando,
Akkulam—Air Force Station,
Thiruvanthapuram,
Kerala State.

.....Respondents

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : Yogender Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent : A. Pruthvi Raj, Advocate

AWARD

1. This is a case taken under Sec. 2 A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh reported in W.P. No. 8395 of 1989 dated 3-8-1995 between Sri U. Chinnappa and M/s. Cotton Corporation of India and two others.

2. The applicant O. Vijaya Kumar has alleged in his application that he was taken as a Helper in first respondent in the year 1991 and posted at Suryalanka Airforce Station situated at Suryalanka near Bapatla and asked him to discharge duties in canteen service department. Household articles and fancy goods are sold in the canteen and the nature of work is permanent in nature. Since his appointment, he was discharging his duties to the utmost satisfaction of the superiors and the respondents were extracting overtime work everyday for two hours and also in Sundays without paying any remuneration and that he was not paid any overtime allowance. He further submitted that he has completed 9 years of continuous service. But he was not regularized in spite of his written representation and his juniors namely Venkata Reddy, Ammaiah, Remadevi, Sreenu, Devadanam, and Ravi Babu are continuing in the service and their services were regularized. The respondents keeping the demand of the applicant for regularisation and for overtime wages, hatched a plan to remove from the services and accordingly he was asked not to come from 26-1-2002 and his services were terminated. The termination of his services is illegal without any reason and prior notice and the respondent not followed the procedure laid down on section 25 of ID Act. The act of the respondent is victimization and unfair labour practices. It is further submitted that the applicant is a poor person and his wife and unmarried sisters are dependent on his income and he could not get alternate employment. He was getting Rs. 1,050 at the time of termination though he was entitled for Rs. 2550/-. He approached the respondents 1 & 2 for his reinstatement into service. But his efforts are in vain and sought the relief for reinstatement into service with back wages and continuity of service with all attendant benefits by setting aside the termination order.

3. The respondent filed their counter stating that the armed forces are excluded from the purview of the operation of Industrial Disputes Act and his Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the application. It is further submitted that the applicant was working as a daily wager in the Airforce Station in the Suryalanka as and when any job required and his job was purely in the nature of casual work for a period of some days as and when any particular job was required to be done and he used to draw a fixed wages according to the days work and denied that he was

paid Rs. 1,500 per month. It is further submitted that the applicant was never been an employee of the Airforce and the job of the applicant was purely a casual in nature and the wages were paid out of the contribution made by the personnel of Airforce Station for their welfare. It is further submitted that the applicant was working as a daily wager for the available jobs where there is no permanent or temporary employee available and further contended that he never worked continuously and also denied that some of his juniors were regularized in service and individuals mentioned by the applicant were working in the organization and their selection is not connected to the applicant and requested to dismiss the application.

4. The applicant filed his affidavit as WW1 besides Abdul Kareem as WW2 in support of his claim and got marked the documents as Ex. W1 to W7(ii). As against this evidence, the respondent filed the affidavit of S.N. Rao.

5. The applicant has reiterated in his affidavit the averments made in his application. Ex. W1 is the temporary pass issued in favour of the applicant containing the photo for identity and it was renewed every month. Ex. W2 is the office copy of the letter addressed to the Wing Commander by the petitioner dated 20-3-2002. Ex. W3 is the reply to exhibit W2 and Ex. W4 & W5 are the representations made by the applicant to the respondents 1 & 2 and Exhibits W6 & W7 are the legal notice got issued by the petitioner to the respondents. Ex. W8 is the certificate issued by the manager of the canteen of the respondent.

6. MW1 has sworn in his affidavit that the applicant was working as daily wager as and when any job is required and that his job was purely in the nature of casual work for some days and never draw any fixed salary and reiterated the averments made in the counter.

7. The Learned Counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is the casual labour worked in the canteen of the respondent as a junior helper for several years and the temporary pass issued by the respondent Ex. W1 discloses that he is the junior helper of the CSD canteen and the pass was extended from 31-12-1999 till the end of 2001 and the petitioner worked for more than 240 days continuously in an year and acquired the temporary status and further contended that there is no distinction between regular employee or casual employee since the daily wage earner comes within the definition of the workmen and further contended that the respondent failed to produce any record to show that the applicant worked only as a daily wager for some days and further contended that the employees of the CSD canteen will not come under the purview of the Armed Act, as such the Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain the same. Further it is submitted that the petitioner has got option either to approach the CAT or this Tribunal and once the petitioner has opted this Tribunal seeking the relief under the ID Act and relied on the decision of the 1987 LAB 1 C page 642 A.P. High Court Full Bench decision—A.P. Steel Wool Industries Cooperative Society Limited, petitioners Vs. Labour Court, Hyderabad and another respondents.

8. On the other hand, the Learned Counsel for the respondent contended that the respondents are governed

by the Air Force Act, 1950. As such this Tribunal has got no jurisdiction to entertain the petition and further contended that the petitioner never worked as a casual labour for more than 240 days in an year. Further the respondent has no power to appoint any person.

9. It is no doubt true that if any person enrolled under the Air Force Act, cannot seek remedy under the Industrial Disputes Act. The petitioner claimed that he was appointed as Junior Helper under CSD canteen. The petitioner comes under the category of Unit Run Canteen employees and the employees under this category can seek their remedy before CAT. The terms and conditions of the service of Unit Run Canteen employees are entirely different with the regular defence forces. The employees of class-V under Unit Run Canteen are classified into Type A, B, C basing on the turnover of the canteen. The type-C category comes where the turnover is less than 5 crores.

10. It is admitted by the respondent witness MW1, the issue of pass Ex. W1 which discloses the photo identity of the petitioner and he was described that he was employed by CSD canteen as Junior Helper and this temporary pass was renewed from time to time. This document shows that the petitioner was worked under CSD canteen as a casual labour for about 2 years. The respondent claimed that the petitioner was engaged occasionally and not employed regularly 240 days in an year, but failed to produce records to that affect. The respondent who is in the custody of records regarding employment of casual labour and payment of wages, has not filed to disprove the claim of the petitioner. It is significant to note that the respondent did not choose to give any reply to the legal notice got issued by the petitioner through his advocate claiming that he worked for 9 years as a casual labour and his services were terminated orally. Further, the respondent did not give any reply to the representations made by the petitioner claiming that he has worked for several years in the canteen or Waiter in the Mess. The representation of the petitioner Ex. W2 shows that he is not properly behaved once at Suryakutir Guest House, as such he was removed and he requested for reinstatement. The conduct on the part of the petitioner that he made a representation to the Wing Commander and the reply received by him shows that he worked as a casual labour under the respondent. In the absence of the record filed by the respondent that the petitioner was employed casually for some days, it cannot be said that the petitioner did not work more than 240 days continuously in an year.

11. The petitioner has stated that his juniors who are worked as casual labour were recruited in the regular vacancies and also given the name of the persons. The respondent pleaded that they were recruited on regular basis and their recruitment is not connected with the petitioner's employment. The respondent did not file any record to show that the persons who are recruited in the canteen are not worked previously as a casual labour and there is no connection to the claim of the petitioner.

12. The petitioner who worked for 240 days in an year as a casual labour comes under the definition of the workmen under ID Act. Therefore the termination of the

petitioner is in violation of section 25(F) of ID Act and the respondent has not followed the procedure for retrenchment of the petitioner. The Learned Counsel relied upon 1985 IV SC cases page 201 H.D. Singh Vs. RBI and others, 2001-1-ILJ Supreme Court of India in between Deep Chandra and State of UP and another, page 1998 III LLJ SC between Rattan Singh and Union of India and another.

13. The propositions laid down by their Lordships in the said Apex Court cases show that the casual labour/daily rated person who worked for more than 240 days in an year is entitled to the protection of his services under 25(F) of ID Act.

14. Since the employees of the Unit Run Canteen are entitled to approach the CAT, they have got option to approach CAT or this Tribunal in view of the judgement of AP High Court Full Bench. Since the petitioner opted this Tribunal, he cannot approach the CAT. Therefore, this Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain the application of the petitioner. In view of the circumstances, I hold that the petitioner has acquired the temporary status and entitled for reinstatement as a casual labour and further he is entitled to be considered for regular appointment in case of arising any permanent vacancy. An award is passed accordingly directing the respondent for his reinstatement as casual employees without any back wages.

Dictated to Shri P. Kanaka Raju, LDC transcribed by him, corrected by me and given under my hand and seal of this court on this the 17th day of August, 2005.

T. RAMACHANDRA REDDY, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for Respondent
WW1 & WW2	MW1

Documents marked for the Petitioner

Ex.W1:	The temporary pass issued by the respondent.
Ex.W2:	The representation of the petitioner dt. 20-3-2002.
Ex.W3:	The office letter of Wing Commander dt. 27-3-2002.
Ex.W4:	The representation of the petitioner dt. 20-4-2002.
Ex.W5:	The representation of the petitioner dt. 17-7-2002.
Ex.W6 (i) & (ii):	The legal notice with acknowledgements.
Ex.W7 (i) & (ii):	The 2nd legal notice with acknowledgements.
Ex.W8:	The certificate dt. 17-1-98 issued by the Manager of the canteen (AF).

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3604.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-1 चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 297/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/185/2000-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3604.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 297/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 1, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-40012/185/2000-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRIRAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 297/2000

Shri Balbir Singh son of Shri Ram Arsa, Village Fatehgarh Chatauli, Post Kurali, Ropar Applicant

Versus

- (1) The Chief General Manager, Telecom, Punjab Circle, Sector 34, Chandigarh-160001
- (2) The Principal General Manager, Telecom, Sector-18, Chandigarh Respondents

APPEARANCES:

For the workman : None

For the management : Shri Anish Babbar

AWARD

Passed on 29-8-2005

Central Government vide notification No. L-40012/185/2000/IR (D.U.) dated 31-07-2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of management of Department of Telecom, Chandigarh in terminating the services of Shri Balbir Singh son of Ram Arsa w.e.f. 27-2-1999 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Counsel for the management submitted that workman is not interested in pursuing the case. This case is pending since 2000 and workman or the authorised representative have not filed claim statement till now. Although in five years workman appeared on two dates, lastly on 21-6-2005 but did not file claim statement. Last opportunity was given to file claim statement on 2-8-05 but the workman neither himself appeared nor his authorised representative. Court notice was issued again in the interest of workman to appear on 29-8-05 for claim statement, he again did not appear today even up to 3.30 PM. Management advocate request that workman is not interested and requested for taking necessary action in view of the above circumstances despite appearing himself on court notice, he again did not appear on two dates nor since 2000 till 29-8-05, in the five years, workman or his authorised representative filed his claim statement. Workman AR has also made a statement earlier that workman appears to be not interested as better employed. In view of the above as it appears that workman is not interested in prosecuting his case as not filed claim statement even in five years. The present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh

29-8-2005

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3605.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं.-1 चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 57/94) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/42/93-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3605.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 57/94) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 1, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-40012/42/93-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE-

**BEFORE SHRI RAJESH KUMAR, PRESIDING
OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-1,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. I.D. 57/94

Shri Nand Lal son of Shri Duni Chand, resident of House
No. 148/A, Kumhar Mandi, Ambala Cantt. (Haryana).

.... Applicant

Versus

(1) The Divisional Engineer, Telecom, (Coaxial),
Department of Telecommunication, 62 Napiar Road,
Ambala Cantt. (Haryana) Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the workman : None

For the management : Shri Dinesh Nagar with Mukund
Singh SDO

AWARD

Passed on

Central Govt. vide notification No. L-40012/42/93/IR
(D.U.) dated 25-07-1994 has referred the following dispute
to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the workman Shri Nand Lal, is entitled
to the benefits of Regularisation of his services
under the scheme casual labourers (grant of
temporary status and regularisation) Scheme of
Telecommunication Deptt. 1989 ? If not, to what
other relief the workman is entitled?"

2. None is present on behalf of the Lrs of the
deceased workman Nand Lal, Management through Shri
Dinesh Nagar Counsel for the management submitted that
management could not trace the Lrs of the deceased
workman Nand Lal. He submitted that Sunita LR who also
left the place and address is not known to the management
now is dead. Court notices were issued to the adult LRs of
workman but are received as undelivered. He also submitted
that since none is appearing on behalf of the workman's
LRs, it appears that they are not interested in pursuing this
case and dispute may be sent back as Sunita wife of the
deceased workman Nand Lal also reported to be dead and
Sikandar and Kamal Kishore adult LRs after moving
application in 2002 are not available and themselves not
appearing. In view of the above and that after moving the
present application for impleading Kamal Kishore and
Sikandar as LRs, Sunita the wife who is now dead and was
the natural guardian of her minor children of Nand Lal,
there is no trace with the management of the LRs of the
deceased. It appears that as there is no trace of LRs of the
deceased as submitted by the management and they are
not appearing after moving the application for impleading
them as LRs, no useful purpose will be served in keeping
this case pending. Therefore, the present reference is
returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution.
Central Govt. be informed. File be consigned to record.

Chandigarh

5-9-2005

RAJESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

AWARD

का. आ. 3606.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-58/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/171/2004-आईआर (डीयू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3606.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-58/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Jaipur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Posts and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-40012/171/2004-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
CUM LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGITD-. 58/2005

Reference No. L-40012/171/2004-IR (DU)

Shri Narayan Lal Meena,
S/o Sh. Pancha Meena,
R/o Village Parsad, Fala Malwa,
Tehsil Sarada, Distt. Udaipur,
Udaipur Applicant

Versus

The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices,
Department of Posts,
Udaipur Manda,
Chatak Circle,
Udaipur Non applicant

PRESENT:

Presiding Officer : SH. R.C. SHARMA
For the applicant : Workman himself
For the non-applicant : None
Date of Award : 31-8-2005

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause 'D' of Sub-sections 1 & 2(A) to Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') has referred this Industrial Dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :

"Whether the action of the management of Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices, Department of Posts, Udaipur in dismissing the services of Sh. Narayan Lal Meena w.e.f. 31-11-2001 is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. The disputant has pleaded in his claim statement that he was employed as a Packer (EDMC) by the non-applicant, who continuously worked up to 2-11-2001, but on 3-11-2001 he was declined by the non-applicant to join the duties. He has further stated that after terminating his service one Sh. Mangi Lal Teli was appointed in his place who is continuously working as Packer till now. He has alleged that prior to the termination of his service, no notice was served on him and the pay in lieu thereof and the retrenchment compensation were not paid to him. He has urged that the termination order dated 3-11-2001 be declared as unjustified and illegal and he be reinstated in the service with all consequential benefits.

3. On 27-5-2005, the officer in-charge of the non-applicant department submitted the written-counter before this Court wherein it has been pleaded by the non-applicant that on attaining the superannuation by Sh. Chatar Singh, Packer, at the post office Parsad, Distt. Udaipur, on 28-2-2001 he was relieved from the office and the disputant Narayan Lal Meena was temporarily employed on the vacant post. But this post was subsequently filled up by selecting Sh. Mangi Lal Teli, a member of the backward class and the disputant was relieved of his work w.e.f. 1-11-2001. It has been further stated that the disputant was temporarily engaged to work who had also submitted an affidavit that his employment is wholly temporary and he would be relieved from the office without serving any notice upon him. It has been categorically stated that Narayan Lal Meena had also applied for the appointment to this post, but the same was reserved for the backward class and on account of it he could not be selected.

4. Subsequent to filing the reply on behalf of the non-applicant, none on his behalf put in appearance before the Court and the *ex parte* proceeding was drawn against him.

5. The workman has submitted his affidavit during the *ex parte* evidence and has also placed on record two documents in support of his claim.

6. I have heard the workman and have gone through the record.

7. The workman is his affidavit has mentioned the facts as narrated by him in his claim statement. As per the charge report dated 1-3-2001 he was relieved from the office w.e.f. the forenoon of 1-3-2001. Another is the certificate dated 3-2-2004, which says that Sh. Narayan Lal Meena has rendered his service w.e.f. 1-3-2001 to 2-11-2001 on the post of EDMC at post office Parsad. The workman's case is that since he has completed continuously 240 days of actual work in a calendar year under the employment of the non-applicant department preceding to the date of his termination, he is entitled to the protection under Section 25-F of the Act as department has not followed the legal requirements enshrined therein. But on a perusal of the written counter, it is obvious that he was employed as a temporary Packer to carry on the official work on account of the retirement of the incumbent to this post and subsequently this post was filled up by selecting a candidate belonging to the backward class and further it has been also clarified in the written-counter that the workman had also applied for appointment to this post, who could not be selected since the post was reserved for the backward class. But nowhere the workman in his affidavit has rebutted these facts. Therefore, it is manifestly clear that the workman was temporarily appointed to this post with an understanding that his engagement would continue till the selection of the suitable candidate to this post and on selection of Mangi Lal Teli, a member of the backward class, this post was filled up. Therefore, his case is attracted by Section 2 (op)(oo) of the Act and his termination does not amount to the retrenchment. Thus, the workman has failed to establish his claim.

8. In the result, the reference is answered in the negative against the workman and in favour of the non-applicant department and it is held that terminating the service of the workman w.e.f. 3-11-2001 is legal and justified and the claim of the workman is rejected. An award is passed in these terms accordingly.

9. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3607.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक विभाग के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-18/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/98/2003-आईआर (डीयू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3607.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT-18/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jaipur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Posts and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-40012/98/2003-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं
श्रम न्यायालय, जयपुर

प्रकरण संख्या : सीजीआईटी-18/2004

निदेश संख्या : एल-40012/98/2003-आईआर (डी.यू.)

शैलान सिंह,
पुत्र श्री बिशन सिंह,
निवासी मु.पो. गोलसर, तहसील रतनगढ़,
जिला चुरू (राजस्थान),
जरिये महामंत्री राजस्थान कैजुअल लेबर यूनियन,
डागा स्कूल के पास, बीकानेर (राजस्थान)

....प्रार्थी

बनाम

1. मुख्य पोस्ट मास्टर जनरल,
राजस्थान परिमंडल, जयपुर
2. निदेशक, डाक सेवा,
राजस्थान वेस्टर्न रीजन, जोधपुर
3. अधीक्षक, डाक घर,
चुरू खंड, चुरू (राजस्थान)

....अप्रार्थीगण

उपस्थित : पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री रमेश चन्द शर्मा

प्रार्थी की ओर से : श्री शिव अवतार सिंह

अप्रार्थी के ओर से : श्री एन.सी. गोयल

पंचाट की तिथि : 17-08-2005

पंचाट

1. केन्द्रीय सरकार के द्वारा यह निदेश धारा 10 की उपधारा (एक) के खंड (घ) व उपधारा 2(ए), औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (संक्षेप में 'अधिनियम') के प्रावधानों के अंतर्गत न्याय निर्णयन हेतु इस न्यायालय को प्रेषित किया गया है, जो निम्नवत है :

"Whether the action of the Management of Chief Post Master General Rajasthan Circle in dismissing

Sh. Shaitan Singh w.e.f. 30-9-97 from service is legal and just? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to end from which date?"

2. श्रमिक ने अपने क्लेम विवरण के अंतर्गत यह कथित किया है कि दिनांक 25-8-1981 को मौखिक आदेश के अनुसार उसकी नियुक्ति शाखा डाकपाल के पद पर गोलसर, चुरू जिला में हुई थी, जिसने विपक्षी संस्थान के अधीन 240 दिनों तक निरन्तर कार्य किया। किन्तु उसके विरुद्ध यह आरोप लगाया गया कि उसने डाकघर की तारीख मोहर को तिजोरी में संभाल कर नहीं रखा जिससे सत्यनारायण सहकर्मी द्वारा गबन किया गया एवं उसने आवर्ती जमा जनरल में प्रविष्टियां नहीं की जिसके कारण गबन हुआ। श्रमिक ने अग्रतर यह अंकित किया है कि उक्त आरोप गलत, अनुचित एवं अवैध है तथा उसके द्वारा आरोपित अवचार नहीं किये गये हैं। किन्तु उसकी सेवा दिनांक 30-9-1997 के आदेश के अनुसार निरस्त कर दी गयी जो कि अनुचित एवं अवैध है। उक्त आदेश के विरुद्ध उसके द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई अपील को भी अपीलीय अधिकारी द्वारा अपने आदेश दिनांक 12-1-1998 के द्वारा निरस्त कर दिया गया। श्रमिक ने सेवा समाप्ति आदेश को चुनौती देते हुए यह अंकित किया है कि उसके विरुद्ध पूर्वाग्रह से प्रसित होकर आरोप पत्र जारी किया गया था तथा उसके द्वारा कोई दुराचरण नहीं किया गया है। उसने यह याचना की है कि सेवा समाप्ति आदेश दिनांक 30-9-1997 निरस्त करते हुए उसे बकाया वेतन सहित सेवा में पुनः नियोजित किया जाये।

3. विपक्षीगण द्वारा अपने संयुक्त प्रतिवाद पत्र में क्लेम का विरोध करते हुए यह अंकित किया गया है कि इस विवाद का श्रवणाधिकार केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण को है, इस न्यायालय को नहीं है तथा श्रमिक/कर्मचारी द्वारा डाकघर नियमावली के नियम 131(3) का उल्लंघन किये जाने पर व अविभागीय एजेंट्स (आचरण व सेवा) नियमावली, 1964 के नियम 17 के अंतर्गत वांछित कर्तव्यनिष्ठा व सत्यनिष्ठा बनाये रखने में असफल रहा है जिसे आरोप पत्र दिनांक 1-8-1996 के द्वारा आरोपित किया गया। उसके विरुद्ध विभागीय राशि का गबन किया जाना सिद्ध पाये जाने पर उसे दिनांक 30-9-1997 के आदेश द्वारा सेवा से निष्कासित किया गया। इस प्रकार विपक्षीगण द्वारा आलोच्य सेवा समाप्ति आदेश का समर्थन किया गया है।

4. श्रमिक ने प्रति-उत्तर में यह अंकित करते हुए कि डाक एवं तार विभाग उद्योग की परिभाषा में आता है तथा प्राथी, अधिनियम के अंतर्गत एक श्रमिक है, अपने वाद विवरण में वर्णित तथ्यों को दोहराया है।

5. दोनों पक्षों को घरेलू जांच की शुद्धता पर सुनने के उपरांत इस न्यायालय के आदेश दिनांक 17-3-2005 के द्वारा घरेलू जांच शुद्ध एवं उचित होना पायी गयी है।

6. विवाद के गुणावगुण पर दोनों पक्षों को सुना गया तथा जांच अभिलेख का अवलोकन किया गया।

7. श्रमिक के विरुद्ध दुराचरण के 4 आरोप निर्मित किये गये हैं। प्रथम एवं द्वितीय आरोप को जांच अधिकारी ने अपने निष्कर्षों के अंतर्गत पूर्णतया सिद्ध होना माना है, जबकि शेष दोनों आरोपों को अंशतः सिद्ध होना अंकित किया है। जांच रिपोर्ट में अंकित निष्कर्षों से अनुशासनिक अधिकारी ने सहमति प्रकट करते हुए श्रमिक को आलोच्य आदेश से दंडित किया है। उसकी अपील भी अपीलीय अधिकारी द्वारा निरस्त की गयी है। इन आरोपों के संबंध में दोनों पक्षों द्वारा किये गये तर्क-वितर्कों पर मैंने सावधानीपूर्वक विचार एवं मनन किया तथा उनके द्वारा प्रस्तुत न्यायिक दृष्टांतों का परिशीलन किया। इनकी विवेचना निम्न प्रकार से की जा रही है।

आरोप संख्या 1

8. श्रमिक के विरुद्ध यह आरोप है कि उसने डाकपाल, गोलसर के पद पर कार्य करते हुए शाखा की डाकघर मुहरों को तिजोरी के अन्दर ताले में बंद कर नहीं रखा जिसके कारण डाक वितरक सत्यनारायण शर्मा ने जमाकर्ताओं के खातों की पासबुक में अनाधिकृत रूप से राशि जमा कर तारीख मुहर का दुरुपयोग करते हुए 2090 रु. की राशि का गबन किया।

9. विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक का यह तर्क है कि साक्षी सत्यनारायण ने अपने कथन में यह स्वीकार किया है कि डाक मुहरों का दुरुपयोग स्वयं उसने किया। उसके कथन दिनांक 19-3-1997 की ओर विद्वान प्रतिनिधि ने इंगित करते हुए यह तर्क किया है कि साक्षी का यह कथन है कि मुहरें डाकघर में खुली रहती थीं जिसका उपयोग उसने श्रमिक की अनुपस्थिति में किया एवं उसने श्रमिक की अनुपस्थिति में किया एवं उसने यह भी कथन किया है कि डाकघर की मुहरें बिना ताले के बंद किये बक्से में ही पड़ी रहती थी, जिसका उपयोग उसने डाकपाल से बिना पूछे स्वयं किया। इस कथन के आधार पर विद्वान प्रतिनिधि का संकथन है कि श्रमिक द्वारा तारीख मुहरों का दुरुपयोग नहीं किया गया अपितु यह दुरुपयोग सत्यनारायण ने किया। इस तर्क का प्रतिवाद विपक्षीगण की ओर से किया गया है।

10. यदि सत्यनारायण के कथन का विश्वास भी किया जाये तब उसके कथन से यह तथ्य स्पष्टतया परिलक्षित होता है कि श्रमिक ने तारीख मुहरों को तिजोरी/बक्से में बन्द करके नहीं रखा व अपने शासकीय कार्य में असावधान रहा जिसके कारण डाक वितरक श्री सत्यनारायण द्वारा इन मुहरों का दुरुपयोग करते हुए गबन किया गया। अतः जांच अधिकारी के निष्कर्ष में हस्तक्षेप करने का कोई औचित्य प्रकट नहीं हुआ है।

आरोप संख्या-2

11. श्रमिक को आरोपित किया गया है कि उसने दिनांक 1-9-1995 को विभिन्न राशियों की, जिनका उल्लेख आरोप में किया गया है, रोजनामचे में प्रविष्टियां नहीं की जिसके कारण सत्यनारायण द्वारा उक्त राशियों के गबन को छिपाया गया।

12. इस संबंध में विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक का तर्क है कि श्रमिक ने जमा की प्रविष्टियां पास-बुक में की हैं किन्तु रोजनामचे में नहीं की तथा मुख्य प्रलेख पास-बुक ही है जो मुख्यालय में जाती है।

13. जांच अधिकारी ने संबंधित साक्ष्य का उल्लेख करते हुए श्रमिक के विरुद्ध यह आरोप पूर्णतः सिद्ध होना पाया है। जांच अधिकारी के निष्कर्ष का भेरे द्वारा सावधानीपूर्वक अवलोकन किया गया जिससे यह स्पष्ट होता है कि श्रमिक/अपचारी द्वारा अपने कर्तव्य का निर्वहन नहीं किया गया एवं जमा राशियों की प्रविष्टियां रोजनामचे में नहीं की गई जिसके कारण सहकर्मी द्वारा उक्त राशियों के किये गये गबन को छिपाया गया व इसका पता विलंब से लगा। अपचारी की ओर से कोई स्पष्टीकरण भी नहीं किया गया है। अतः इस आरोप को सिद्ध मानने में जांच अधिकारी द्वारा कोई भूल नहीं की गई है।

आरोप संख्या-3

14. श्रमिक/अपचारी के विरुद्ध आरोप है कि उसने दिनांक 20-12-1995 को डाकघर शाखा में प्राप्ता बी.पी.पी., मूल्य 275 रु. न तो प्राप्तकर्ता को वितरित की न ही वापस लेखा कार्यालय को लौटाई तथा उसका दुरुपयोग कर उसका खोना बताया। जांच अधिकारी ने अपने निष्कर्षों में यह अंकित किया है कि उक्त बी.पी.पी. को प्राप्तकर्ता ने छुड़ाया ही नहीं, अतः उसकी रकम वसूल नहीं की जा सकी तथा कथित बी.पी.पी. गोलसर डाक शाखा में प्राप्ता हुई थी जो कि प्राप्तकर्ता को वितरित नहीं की गयी और न ही अवितरित होने पर मुख्य डाकघर रतनगढ़ को लौटाई गई। इस आधार पर अंशतः आरोप सिद्ध होना जांच अधिकारी ने स्वीकार किया है। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक का इस संबंध में केवल मात्र तर्क यह है कि सत्यनारायण ने अपने साक्ष्य में यह स्वीकार किया है कि प्राप्तकर्ता घर में नहीं मिला था इस कारण उसे बी.पी.पी. वितरित नहीं की जा सकी। किन्तु सत्यनारायण के इस कथन से श्रमिक को उसके शासकीय दायित्व से मुक्त होना स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता तथा जांच अधिकारी के द्वारा अंशतः आरोपसिद्ध होना स्वीकार करने के निष्कर्ष में हस्तक्षेप करने का कोई औचित्य प्रकट नहीं हुआ है।

आरोप संख्या-4

15. अपचारी के विरुद्ध यह आरोप है कि उसने डाकपाल के पद पर कार्य करते हुए दिसम्बर, 1995 एवं फरवरी, 1996 की विभिन्न दिनांकों में डाकघर अतिशेष में अधिकृत नकदी सीमा न्यूनतम 50 रु. तथा अधिकतम 250 रु. से अनावश्यक नकदी सीमा से अधिक रोककर रकम का अस्थायी रूप से दुरुपयोग किया। इस आरोप को अंशतः सिद्ध होना जांच अधिकारी ने अंकित किया है।

16. विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक का संकथन है कि श्रमिक 50 रु. से 250 रु. तक की राशि रख सकता था किन्तु इससे अधिक की राशि रखने का आरोप सिद्ध नहीं हुआ है। अतः जांच अधिकारी का निष्कर्ष विरोधाभासी है। इसका प्रतिवाद विपक्षीगण की ओर से किया गया है।

17. जांच अधिकारी ने अपने रिपोर्ट के अंतर्गत इस बिन्दु पर साक्ष्य का विवरण करते हुए उन विभिन्न दिनांकों व विभिन्न राशियों का उल्लेख किया है जो श्रमिक ने अधिकृत सीमा से अधिक होने के उपरांत भी अपने पास रखी इस निष्कर्ष को खंडित करने का कोई आधार विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक नहीं दर्शा पाये हैं। अतः इस आरोप को अंशतः सिद्ध होना स्वीकार करते समय जांच अधिकारी द्वारा अपने निष्कर्ष को साक्ष्य पर आधारित किया गया है जो हस्तक्षेपनीय नहीं है।

18. उक्त आकलन के आधार पर जांच अधिकारी के निष्कर्ष औचित्यपूर्ण हैं तथा वे अभिलेख के अनुरूप हैं जो हस्तक्षेपनीय नहीं हैं।

19. विद्वान प्रतिनिधि विपक्षीगण के द्वारा बहस के मध्य इस बिन्दु पर अधिक बल दिया गया कि श्रमिक की नियुक्ति नियमों के अंतर्गत की गई है तथा विभागीय निष्कर्षों के अंतर्गत ही उसे आरोपित किया जाकर दंडित किया गया है। अतः प्रकरण की सुनवाई का क्षेत्राधिकार केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक अधिकरण को प्राप्त है, इस न्यायालय को नहीं। विद्वान प्रतिनिधि ने अपने तर्क के समर्थन में ए.आई.आर. 1996 सर्वोच्च न्यायालय 1271 दृष्टांत को प्रस्तुत किया जिसके अंतर्गत यह संधारित किया गया है कि डाक व दूरसंचार विभाग धारा 2 (जे) अधिनियम के अनुसार उद्योग नहीं है। इसके विपरीत विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक का संकथन है कि विपक्षी संस्थान एक औद्योगिक इकाई है तथा विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक द्वारा अपने पक्ष समर्थन में 1998 डी एंड जे (सर्वोच्च न्यायालय) 41 दृष्टांत को प्रस्तुत किया गया है जिसके अंतर्गत माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय द्वारा अपने पूर्व न्यायिक दृष्टांत ए.आई.आर. 1996 सर्वो. न्या. 1271 का उल्लेख करते हुए यह प्रतिपादित किया गया है कि निर्णय 1996 सर्वो. न्या. संधारण योग्य नहीं है तथा दूरसंचार विभाग को ए.आई.आर. सर्वोच्च न्यायालय 548 बंगलौर वाटर सप्लाई एण्ड सीवरेज बोर्ड में प्रतिपादित सिद्धांत के अनुसार उद्योग होना स्वीकार किया है। अतः प्रदर्शित न्यायिक दृष्टांत से विद्वान प्रतिनिधि श्रमिक के तर्क का समर्थ होता है तथा विपक्षीगण द्वारा किये गये तर्क उक्त परिवेश में अमान्य हैं।

20. मैंने श्रमिक/अपचारी को दिये गये दंड की मात्रा पर भी विचार किया। विवाद की गंभीर प्रकृति को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए आरोपित दंड अत्यधिक होना स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकता है। अतः दंड आदेश पुष्ट किये जाने योग्य है।

21. उक्त विवेचना के आधार पर इस निदेश का निस्तारण इस प्रकार किया जाता है कि विपक्षी संस्थान द्वारा श्रमिक के विरुद्ध पारित सेवा-मुक्ति आदेश दिनांक 30-9-1997 वैध एवं उचित है तथा श्रमिक का क्लेम निरस्तनीय है। इस रूप में पंचाट पारित किया जाता है।

22. पंचाट की प्रतिलिपियां केन्द्र सरकार को अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत प्रकाशनार्थ प्रेषित की जाए।

आर. सी. शर्मा, पीठासीन अधिकारी

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3608.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सी.पी.डब्ल्यू.डी. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. I, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 91/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/10/96-आई आर (डीयू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3608.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 91/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. I, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of CPWD and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-42011/10/96-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI****PRESIDING OFFICER : SHRI S. S. BAL****I. D. No. 91/97**

In the matter of dispute between :—

Shri Gulab Singh & 3 ors.
Through the General Secretary
C.P.W.D. Mazdoor Union, E-26,
Raja Bazar, Baba Khark Singh Marg,
New Delhi-110 001.

Workmen

Versus

The Executive Engineer,
Electrical Constt. Dn. III,
C.P.W.D., Pushpa Bhawan,
New Delhi-110 019.

Management

APPEARANCES : Shri B.K. Prasad for the Workman.

Shri Bhisham Dev Mund for management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-42011/10/96-IR(DU) Dated 24/25-06-97 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

“Whether the action of the management of CPWD in terminating the services of the following workmen as Lift Operator w.e.f. dates mentioned against each name is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

Name of workmen	Date of engagement	Date of termination
1. Gulab Singh	1-7-93.	10-1-95
2. Sanjay	1-8-93	1-1-95
3. Shambhu Prasad	1-7-93	17-1-95
4. Ravinder	1-7-93	17-1-95

2. Brief facts of this case as culled from record are that the workmen namely Gulab Singh, Sanjay, Shambhu Prasad and Ravinder claimed that the management camouflagedly introduced so called contractor M/s. 3 Star Ex-serviceman Association, RZF-27/1, Indira Park, Palam Colony, New Delhi but practically the workers were working directly under the supervision and control of the above management. It is further averred that the management had been paying less minimum wages than fixed by the appropriate government from time to time under Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and in that case the Junior Engineers concerned accepted that the workmen were performing their duties under the supervision and direct control of the management of CPWD. The workmen raised the dispute for payment of minimum wages payable to the skilled workmen but the management terminated their services with a view to teach them a lesson for raising dispute before the appropriate authority and that the workmen also raised the dispute for their regularisation of their services as the management has been taking work from the above workmen camouflagedly with a view to deny the status of a regular workman after completion of 90 days of service. They also claimed equal pay for equal work. That the job of the workmen is of perennial in nature and the management engaged lift operators through contractors only with a view to employ the workmen on the basis of hire and fire which is not permissible under I.D. Act. Management terminated service of the workmen by verbal orders without following the provisions of the I.D. Act, 1947 arbitrarily without payment of compensation and without giving notice which is illegal & Unjustified. The action of the management is in violation of the principles of natural as well as against the provisions of section 25-G of the I.D. Act and contrary to the settlement arrived at between the management of CPWD and workmen Union on 15-11-89 Under section 12(3) of the I.D. Act in pursuance of which possibility of getting maintenance work through departmental labour has to be explored through Department of Labour before awarding the work of maintenance to the contractor as contained in letter dated 28-12-89. The respondent is bound by the settlement engagement of contract labour by the Govt. establishment is also contrary to the Apex Court decision dated 9-5-96. The workmen claim pay for equal work which is not being paid to them and is against the condition of their service. The workmen performed the work which falls within the ambit of definition of word ‘Industries’ as defined in the payment of Minimum Wages Act, 1936. It is further averred that on completion of 90 days continuous service workmen are entitled to/deemed to have attained permanent status under Model Standing Rules under I.D. Act but the management has denied

this facility to the workmen which amount of discrimination. In view of the above workmen claim reinstatement with full back wages continuity in service & consequential benefit.

3. Claim has been contested by filing written statement raising preliminary objection that the workman has no locus standi to prefer this claim against the respondent as there is no industrial dispute between the parties and that as there is no relationship of employer and employee and master and servant between the claimant & management and as such the reference is not maintainable and this court has no jurisdiction. It is specifically mentioned that the claimant was engaged by Contractor Agency M/s, Three Star Ex-servicemen Associates RWZY/F/1, Indira Park, Palam Colony, New Delhi and present dispute is not covered "under section 2-K of the I.D. Act.

4. On merits it is denied that the management camouflagedly introduced so called contractor i.e. Three Star Ex-servicemen Associates. It is however, not denied that to the workmen initiated proceedings before under law and a sum of Rs. 14,654/- was ordered to be paid to the workers towards the prescribed wages vide order dated 15/21-2-97 passed by the court. It is denied that respondent management terminated the services of workmen as claimed or that they are entitled to equal pay for equal work or to reinstatement as claimed.

5. Written statement was followed by rejoinder in which workmen denied simplicitor the contentions raised by the management.

6. Thereafter issue in terms of reference was framed as per pleadings and the matter was posted for evidence of the management.

7. management filed affidavit of Shri S.K. Sachdeva Executive Engineer in evidence who was cross-examination as MW1 on 22-9-95, 2-9-99 and 10-1-2000. Thereafter the matter was fixed for evidence of the workmen and the workmen were afforded as many as five opportunities to adduce evidence but failed to produce its evidence as such matter was fixed for arguments vide order dated 16-1-2001 by my learned predecessor. I have heard the parties. Perusal of record shows that the controversies involved in this case is whether the above named workmen were the employee of the management, there existed relationship of workman and management respondent i.e. whether the workmen were there employee of the management and whether there existed any dispute between the workmen and the management within the ambit of section 2-K of the I.D. Act, whether the workmen are entitled to the relief of reinstatement with full back wages and equal pay for equal work as claimed.

8. Perusal of record shows that the workmen did not adduce any evidence that they were the employees of the management. However, it is admitted fact that they were working as a lift operator at Lodhi Road and they were engaged by contractor M/s. Ex-servicemen Associates known as Three Star Ex-servicemen Associates RZ-2 Y, F/1 Palam Colony which is a private agency. An attempt has been made to show that the workmen worked

under the supervision of the Junior Engineer or Engineer of the CPWD and statement of Perdeep Kumar J.E. CPWD and Sh. Surinder Singh JE and M.S. Dhali JE recorded during proceedings before Authority under the Minimum Wages Act were placed on record but they were not duly proved on record to show that the workmen worked under the supervision of the management and has not been duly proved. Thus the workman has infact adduced no evidence to prove its claim. In these circumstances a 'No dispute' Award is passed. File be consigned to record room.

Dated: 30-08-2005

S. S. BAL, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3609.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑल इंडिया रेडियो के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. I, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 38/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/109/99-आई आर (डीयू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2005

S.O. 3609.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 38/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. I, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of All India Radio and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-10-2005.

[No. L-42011/109/99-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

PRESIDING OFFICER : SHRI S. S. BAL

I. D. No. 38/2000

In the Matter of dispute between :—

Shri Raghubir Dutt & Others,
Represented by the President,
Akhil Bhartiya Akashvani Group 'D',
Karamchhari Sangh. Room No. 206.
Akashvani Bhavan,
New Delhi-110 001

.... Workmen

versus

The Director General,
All India Radio,
Akashvani Bhavan, Parliament Street,
New Delhi-110 001

.... Management

APPEARANCES : Shri V.N. Jha alongwith Sh. Jagdish Prasad, Vice President of the Employees Union. Smt. Shyama Kuttu, Under Secretary from the Deputy Director, Admn.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-42011/I09/99-IR(DU) dated 02-03-2000 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether the action of the Management of All India Radio in the circumstances of the case is justified in transferring S/Shri Raghubir Dutt, President, B.N. Jha, General Secretary of the Union suspending Sh. Ram Chander, Security Guard and not regularising the entire suspension period by deducting the kind of leave due and available to the workman? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?"

2. Brief facts of the case are that the workmen namely S/Shri Raghubir Dutt, President, B.N. Jha, General Secretary of the Union and Sh. Ram Chander, Security Guard, its regular members are duly elected office bearers. The Executive Committee of the claimant Union namely resolved to espouse and represent the case of the aforesaid workmen before this Tribunal and it is averred that Akhil Bhartiya Akashvani Group 'D' Karamchhari Sangh was one of the constituents of Akashvani & Doordarshan Karamchhari Samyukta Sangh which led agitation against the management and struck work from 6-4-99 to 16-4-99 to press their demand for pay hike and filling up of vacant posts Group 'D' posts etc., and therefore on a call of the Sangh for strike in support of their genuine demands they participated in it alongwith other employees till negotiations started by the Management with the representatives of workers on their charter of demands; that to curb the legitimate Trade Union activities and to break the strike the Management of All India Radio resorted to repressive measures by victimizing them in various ways and the office bearers namely S/Shri Raghubir Dutt, B.N. Jha, and Ram Chander, were suspended wrongfully and on revocation of their suspension they were wrongfully transferred from place of duty. Raghubir Dutt was suspended on 9-4-93 without serving order and was transferred to office of Chief Engineer, CCW Soochna Bhavan, New Delhi, B.N. Jha, was suspended on 9-4-1999 and his suspension was revoked vide order dated 28-6-99 and transferred to STI (P) Kingsway Camp, Delhi and Ram Chander Security Guard was suspended on 9-4-99 and suspension was revoked on 28-6-99 but for malafide reasons he was pushed out of his place of duty to STI (P) Kingsway Camp, Delhi. It is further averred that besides that some of the other employees were suspended wrongfully, transferred and victimised

for seeking improvement in service conditions and hike in pay scales on the basis of parity with other employees in the industry, the action of the management in suspending Shri Raghubir Dutt who was President of the registered Union, Trade Union was apparently to victimise the said President for his legitimate Trade Union activities for seeking improvement in pay scales and conditions of service of Group 'D' employees in the organization.

3. It is further averred that the said Union held peaceful meetings, demonstrations and dharnas in support of their legitimate demands without resorting to any violent action at all. The action of the management in suspending the office-bearers and other members of the Union and subsequently transferring them on revocation of the suspension orders was clearly arbitrary, wrong, malafide and vindictive as well as contrary to the Transfer Policy of AIR in respect of Group 'D' staff and that the attitude of the management towards employees and office bearers is biased and action of the management in not regularising the period of suspension by grant of leave is questionable. It is further stated that under the statutory rules there is no provision for treating the period of suspension as kind of the leave due. As such both the instructions and action of the management are violative of the rules and illegal. In view of the above circumstances all the workmen claim to be reinstated in their original place of posting before strike as the strike was legal and justified and resorted to only as a last resort for acceptance of their legitimate demands after exhausting all available channels for redressal of their grievances through negotiations/discussions & no leave to the credit of employee be deducted especially when the management has failed to follow the procedure under rules and law to establish employee's misconduct by serving an appropriate charge sheet before revocation of their suspensions. It is also requested to look into the issue connected with the dispute in its totality and in the interest of equity and justice & grant further relief's due in the facts and circumstances of the case.

4. The claim has been contested by filing written statement by the management raising preliminary objection stating that the workmen led agitation against the management and struck work from 6-4-99 to 16-4-99 to press their demands of pay hike and filling up of vacant posts, pay parity, promotions to post of Daftries, etc. The management had tried to mediate with them but were unsuccessful because of the arrogant attitude of the workman. The workman also resorted to immature activities like littering the office corridors with garbage, blocking of pipes in the toilets, holding of unauthorised meetings and demonstrations within the office premises. The Sangh had been instructed vide specific orders that

holding of unauthorised meetings and demonstrations were banned within the office premises. Notwithstanding this, the Group 'D' Sangh went on strike and created lawlessness situation by holding illegitimate and unauthorised gate meetings/demonstrations. This was in clear violations of the instructions issued to them. Therefore the suspension order of employees were passed and after suspension orders they were transferred as stated. On merits it is stated that Group 'D' association is recognised and that all the demands made by the workmen were not proper and action of the management is in suspending transferring and treating the strike period as leave is justified.

5. The workman filed rejoinder wherein contents of the claim statement were reiterated to be correct and those of controverted pleas in the written statement were denied.

6. I have heard the parties. One of the employees Raghubir Singh is reported to have expired and the other workmen appeared. They did not press all disputes in reference. They gave up their claim for re-transfer of reinstatement to the original place of posting and their suspension stood revoked. No evidence was required to be adduced as the facts were admitted. The claimants pressed that the period of strike be treated on duty & not on leave.

7. Mrs. Shyama Kutty Under Secretary, Deputy Director, Administration appeared and the respondent. She placed the order dated 10-8-2005 that the strike period was treated as leave from 6-4-99 to 16-4-99 and it was not found feasible to treat the period of absence during the strike as on duty.

8. The Claimants resorted to and participated in the strike. Their suspension period has been revoked. Even their transfer orders appeared to have been, revoked, they failed to justify their claim that the period can be treated as on duty. In my view order of the management dated 10-8-2005 treating period of strike during which claimants struck work as on leave does not suffer from any legal infirmity and action of the management in not regularising the entire suspension period by deducting the leave due and available to workmen appears to be justified. No harm has been caused to the workmen. The reference is answered accordingly.

S. S. BAL, Presiding Officer

Dated : 30-08-2005

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3610.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार

आकाशवाणी दूरदर्शन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, लखनऊ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 9/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/23/2004-आई आर (सीएम-II)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3610.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 9/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Akashwani Doordarshan, All India Radio and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-09-2005.

[No. L-42012/23/2004-IR(CM-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, LUCKNOW

Present : Shrikant Shukla Presiding Officer

L D. No. 9/2005.

Ref. No : L-42012/23/2004-IR(CM-II) dated : 28-1-2005

BETWEEN

Sh. Prem Chand Verma, S/o Sh. Ujagar Prasad
Niwasi E-O/4, G.T.B. Nagar, Kaeli
Allahabad.

AND

1. The Chief Engineer (North Zone), Akashwani Doordarshan, Jamnagar House, Shahjahan Road, N. Delhi.
2. The Station Engineer, All India Radio, Allahabad.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide their Order No. L-42012/23/2004-IR(CM-II) dated 28-1-2005 has referred following dispute for adjudication. to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Prasar Bharati (Akashwani) through its Chief Engineer (North Zone), New Delhi in terminating Shri Prem Chand Verma S/o Shri Ujagar Prasad from the service w.e.f. 31-3-1997 is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?"

The reference order was endorsed to Shri Prem Chand Verma, the workman and the Chief Engineer (North Zone), Akashwani Doordarshan, Jamnagar House, Shahjahan Road, N. Delhi and the Station Engineer, All India Radio, Allahabad. The reference order was received

in Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Lucknow on 15-2-2005, but the workman did not file statement of claim till 18-3-2005. Thereafter, the Presiding Officer ordered the issuance of registered notice to the workman with direction to file statement of claim complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses by 29-4-2005. The registered notice was issued to the workman on 18-3-2005, vide receipt No. 3003 dated 30-3-2005. The office has informed that the registered article containing notice to the workman did not return, unserved in the Tribunal till 16-5-2005 as such, service of notice upon the workman was presumed and the Presiding Officer ordered to issue notice to the opposite party to file written statement. The registered notices were issued to opposite parties No. 1 & 2. In pursuance to the notices Sh. Prashant Kumar appeared on behalf of opposite party Nos. 1 on 22-7-2005; and filed his authority, signed by Sh. H.R. Singh, Chief Engineer (N/Z), Air & Doordarshan, Jam Nagar House, N. Delhi, but did not file any written statement and sought time to file written statement. Therefore, 5-8-2005 was fixed for filing of written statement. On 5-8-2005 also the opposite party did not file written statement and sought time for filing the written statement and 22-8-2005 was fixed. Even today parties are absent and opposite party has not filed any written statement.

The worker, Prem Chand Verma has not turned up with the allegation that he was an employee appointed by the Chief Engineer, Akashwani Doordarshan and that his termination was illegal. It was for the worker to allege and prove the facts, but the worker has failed to allege and prove the facts. In the circumstances the reference cannot be answered. No claim award is passed accordingly.

SHRIKANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

Lucknow.
22-8-2005.

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3611.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय खाद्य निगम के प्रबंधांत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 45/1999) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/161/1998-आई आर (सी-II)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3611.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 45/1999)

of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 1 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Food Corporation of India, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 14-09-2005.

[No. L-22012/161/1998-IR(C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference U/S. 10(1)(d) (2A) of I.D.
Act. 1947

Reference No. 45 of 1999.

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of
Food Corporation of India.

AND

Their Workmen.

Present : Shri Sarju Prasad, Presiding Officer.

Appearances:

For the Employers : Shri A. Kumar, AGM(ID).

For the Workman : None.

State : Bihar. Industry : Food.

Dated, the 25th August, 2005.

AWARD

By Order No. L-22012/161/98-IR(CM-II) dated 23-3-1999 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-sec. (1) and sub-sec. (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman Sh. Robin Kumar Sinha, Ex-Stenographer Grade-II from service w.e.f. 04-03-1997 during the pendency of proceeding before the Conciliation Officer is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?”

2. Shri A. Kumar appearing on behalf of the management by filing a petition submits that the present dispute has already been decided by the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad earlier. In support of his petition he has filed a photo copy of certified copy of award.

3. In view of such submission being made, I render a ‘No Dispute’ Award in the present case.

SARJU PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3612.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जनगणना

निदेशालय के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 34/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/84/2003-आई आर (सी-II)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3612.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 34/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Directorate of Census Operation, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 14-09-2005.

[No. L-42012/84/2003-IR(C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT-34/2004.

Reference No : L-42012/84/2003-IR(C-II)

Sh. Tarachand,
S/o Sh. Dulichand,
A-II, Vidhyadhar Nagar,
Jaipur

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The Director,
Directorate of Census Operation,
Rajasthan Jhalana Dungari,
Jaipur

2. The Assistant Director,
Directorate of Census Operation,
Rajasthan Jhalana Dungari,
Jaipur

.....Non-applicants

Present

Presiding Officer : Sh. R. C. Sharma.

For the applicant : Sh. M.F. Baig.

For the non-applicants : Sh. N.C. Goyal.

Date of award : 26-8-2005

AWARD

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 'D' of Sub-Sections 1 & 2(A) to Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') has referred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

“क्या कर्मचारी श्री ताराचंद पुत्र श्री दुलीचंद की प्रबंधन जनगणना कार्य निदेशालय, राजस्थान, जयपुर द्वारा दिनांक 15-7-1996 से की गई सेवा मुक्ति न्यायोचित एवं सही है ? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मचारी किस अनुतोष का हकदार है एवं किस तिथि से ?”

2. The claimant has pleaded in his claim statement that he was initially employed as a 4th class on 7-3-1991 by the non-applicant establishment, who continuous worked for more than 6 years upto 15-7-1996 and completed 240 days of service in each calendar year with the establishment, whose service was terminated on 15-7-1996 in contravention of provision under Section 25-F of the Act. He has further stated that he is a workman and the work performed by him is of perennial nature. According to his averments, his service was terminated without following the provisions under Section 25-G of the Act and subsequent to his termination, the fresh hands were recruited in violation of the provision under Section 25-H of the Act. He has urged that the termination order dated 15-7-1996 be declared illegal and unjustified and he be reinstated in the service with back-wages and all consequential reliefs.

3. Resisting the claim of the workman, the non-applicants in their written counter have stated that the dispute has been raised after the long lapse of 12 years, which is liable to be rejected on this ground and that the workman was engaged to work as a casual labour for a specified period and for specified work. It has been further stated that it was a sovereign function of the Government of India and on this count, the non-applicant establishment is not an industry. The non-applicants have also added that there is no sanctioned post of casual with the establishment.

4. In the rejoinder, the workman has reiterated the facts as pleaded by him in his claim statement.

5. On the pleadings of both the parties, the following points for determination were framed :—

- I. Whether the workman was appointed as 4th Class on 7-3-1991 by the non-applicant management, who continuously worked up to 14-7-1996 and whose service was terminated on 15-7-96 in violation of Section 25-F of the Act and Rule 77 of the Industrial Dispute Rules, 1957? BOA
- II. Whether at the time of terminating the service of the workman, the junior employees to him were retained by the management in violation of Section 25-G of the Act? BOA
- III. Whether after the termination of the workman the new appointments were made by the management in violation of Section 25-H of the Act and Rule 78 of the Industrial Dispute Rules, 1957? BOA

IV. Whether the claimant is a workman as defined under Section 2-S of the Act? BOA

V. Whether the claim is liable to be rejected on the ground of raising the dispute belatedly? BOA

VI. Whether the non-applicant establishment does not fall within the definition of industry as defined under Section 2-J of the Act? EONA

VII. Relief, if any.

6. In the evidence, the workman has examined himself as WW-1 and on behalf of the non-applicants, the counter affidavit of MW-1 H.C. Sharma, Assistant Director has been placed on record in rebuttal. Both these witnesses were cross-examined by the respective opposite representative. Both the parties have also led the documentary evidence.

7. I have heard both the parties and have scanned the record. The point-wise discussion follows as under :—

Point No. I & IV

8. Both these points being identical on question of facts and law are discussed together as hereunder.

9. The Id. representative for the workman contends that the claimant had regularly worked from 7-3-1991 to 15-7-1996 with the non-applicant department who has submitted the documents Ex. W-1 to W-16 in support of his claim which disclose that he was uninterruptedly serving the non-applicant department and he is, therefore, entitled to get the benefit under Section 25-B(1) of the Act. But his service was terminated without issuing any prior notice to him nor he was paid one month pay in lieu of the notice nor the retrenchment compensation and the department has acted in violation of Section 25-F of the Act.

10. Per contra, the Id. representative for the non-applicants submits that 78 posts of casual worker were created by the Home Ministry for the period from 1-3-1991 to 29-2-1992 and on one of the posts the workman was employed as a casual worker as and when his services were required and the engagement was for a specific period on the expiry of which it came to an automatic end. The Id. representative further contends that only during this period the disputant had worked as a 4th class and beyond this period he had not worked under the employment of the department. The Id. representative also contends that the documents R-1 to R-16 show that he was employed by the Home Guard Training Centre as a volunteer in the department, who cannot be treated as the employee of the Census Department and the workman has not uninterruptedly worked with the department during the disputed period.

11. I have bestowed my thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions and have gone through the

judicial pronouncements referred to on behalf of both the parties.

12. The Id. representative for the workman has sought to invoke the provision contained under Section 25-B(1), which envisages that the workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including the service which may be interrupted on account of his sickness or strike or cessation of work which is not due to any fault on his part. Therefore, the question which arises for determination is whether the workman was in a continuous service during the period commencing from 7-3-1991 to 15-7-1996.

13. The workman's case is that he was under the employment of the department during the spells in question and has relied upon the documents Ex. W-1 to W-16, whereas the department's stand is that the workman was engaged as a casual labour from 7-3-91 to 29-2-92 to carry out the functions of the department and these posts were created by the order Ex. M-2 and subsequent to this period, his service was afforded by it to the department, but on calling for the names of the security guards from the Home Guard Training Centre, he was deployed by it in the department. The non-applicants have placed his reliance upon the documents Ex. M-1 to M-11.

14. To begin with, vide order Ex. M-1 dated 1-11-90 of the Ministry of Home Affairs, various posts including the 78 post of the casual labour were created w.e.f. 1-3-91 to 29-2-92 in connection with the 1991 census. Thus, these posts were created for specified period and for specified job to be carried out by the incumbent of these posts. With the assistance of the ID Card Ex. W-1 dated 2-5-91, workman has endeavoured to establish that he was employed as a 4th Class by the non-applicant department. This ID Card says that the claimant is working as a 4th class at Kalptaru Shopping Centre Office at Shastri Nagar, Jaipur MW-1, S.C. Sharma has deposed that workman was engaged as a casual labour from 7-3-91 to 29-2-92 as and when he was required to carry out the functions of the department. But the workman has not claimed that during this period he had completed continuously 240 days of actual service with the department, nor he has adduced any documentary evidence except Ex. W-1 to prove this fact. As such there is no dispute that the workman had served the department w.e.f. 7-3-91 to 29-2-92 as a 4th class (casual labour) on job-required basis due to the creation of these posts.

15. The workman has adduced Ex. W-2 to W-16 to justify that he was in continuous service of the department for the remaining period subsequent to 29-2-92 till 31-1-94 by stating that he was re-employed by the department as chowkidar during this period Ex. W-2

appears to be the note sheet which states that Tarachand (workman) will deposit the key of the office in the morning, which indicates that he was employed as a chowkidar. Thereafter, Ex W-4 to W-16 are the duty details of the chowkidar which bear the name of Tarachand as such detailing his duty period, e.g., vide Ex. W-24 he discharged his duties as chowkidar from 1-10-92 to 15-10-92, vide Ex. W-5 from 1-12-92 to 15-12-92, vide Ex. W-6 from 16-12-92 to 31-12-92, vide Ex. W-7 from 1-1-93 to 15-1-93, vide Ex. W-8 from 15-2-93 to 28-2-93, vide Ex. W-9 from 1-3-93 to 16-3-93, vide Ex. W-10, 4 days plus 28-3-93, vide Ex. W-11 from 16-4-93 to 30-4-93, vide Ex. W-12 from 1-5-93 to 16-5-93, Ex. W-13 from 17-5-93 to 31-5-93, vide Ex. W-14 from 1-7-93 to 15-7-93, vide Ex. W-15 from 1-9-93 to 15-9-93 and lastly vide Ex. W-16 he discharged his duties from 16-1-94 to 31-1-94. It is, therefore, crystal clear from the perusal of these documents that he was working as a chowkidar in the office of the Census Department during the aforesaid period.

16. To rebut the plea of the workman that he was re-employed as a chowkidar by the department, the non-applicants have placed on record various documents in support of their contention that his services were provided to the department on its request by the Home Guard Training Centre. Ex. M-4 is a letter addressed by the Deputy Director of the department to the authority of the Home Guard Training Centre, Jaipur whereby he was requested to send the volunteers on 30-6-95 to depute them as Home Guard for the safety of the public property. Vide order Ex. M-2 dated 11-5-92, the department had sanctioned the budget for the payment of the wages to the volunteers of the Home Guard Training Centre for the period from 16-4-92 to 30-4-92. In this sanctioned order at serial no. 4 figures the name of the workman Tarachand. Vide order Ex. M-3 dated 28-5-92, the amount of wages was sanctioned for the period from 1-5-92 to 16-5-92, vide orders Ex. M-5 from 1-6-92 to 30-6-92, Ex. M-7 from 1-8-92 to 31-8-92, Ex. M-8 from 15-2-93 to 28-2-93, Ex. M-9 from 1-4-93 to 15-4-93, Ex. M-11 from 16-4-93 to 30-4-93 and Ex. M-10 from 1-5-93 to 31-5-93. In all these orders ranks the name of Tarachand as Volunteer pertaining to the Home Guard Training Centre. It flows from these documents that from the period 16-4-92 to 13-5-93 in different spells the services of the workman were made available to the department by the Home Guard Training Centre he was not directly engaged by the Census Department as its employee. Therefore, the nexus of master and servant does not exist between the parties during this subsequent period.

17. Turning to the oral evidence, the workman in his cross-examination has admitted that no written appointment order was issued to him. Though he has stated that he was regularly appointed forever by the

department, yet he has failed to bring on the record any documentary evidence in support of his submission. MW-1, H.C. Sharma in his cross-examination had emphatically denied that the workman had ever served the department subsequent to 29th February, 92 but has stated that the workman was sent by the Home Guard Training Centre and he had not served the department till 15-7-96. Further he has deposed that subsequent to 29-2-92 he was working as a chowkidar in the capacity of homeguard.

18. On the analytical examination of the documentary as well as oral evidence as discussed above, it is established that the workman was temporarily engaged for a specified period intermittently from 7-3-91 to 29-2-92 to discharge the functions of the Census Department as a casual worker on creation of the posts vide order Ex. M-2. But subsequent to it he was not directly engaged by the non-applicant department, but on the request of it, his services were afforded to the non-applicant department as a homeguard by the Home Guard Training Centre and, therefore, no relationship of employer and employee was created during the spell from 17-8-92 till 31-1-94 during the period he is stated to have worked as a chowkidar. As such, he cannot be treated to be in the continuous service of the non-applicant department for this period in question and no relationship of master and servant existed during this period. Therefore, the workman has failed to discharge the onus of point No. 1.

19. So far as the question of the workman as concerned, there is no dispute that from 7-3-91 to 29-2-92 the workman was engaged on contractual basis and on work-requirement on account of creation of the post of casual labourers to carry out the functions of the Census Department. As stated earlier, these posts were created in connection with the 1991 census and with the efflux of time, the employment automatically stood terminated subsequent to 29-2-92. As such, no relationship of employer and employee existed between the parties during the period 7-3-91 to 29-2-92 and the case is attracted by the provision under Section 2(oo)(bb) of the Act. Therefore, the disputant is not a workman within the meaning of Section 2-S of the Act. Accordingly, points No. I and IV are decided against the workman.

Point No. II

20. The ld. representative for the workman contends that the employees Ashok Damodar and Ram Bhajan were junior to the workman whose services were retained by the department and there is no cross-examination of the workman by the non-applicants on this point and it could not be rebutted by the management witness in his affidavit. On the other hand, the ld. representative for the non-applicants contends that no such persons were retained by the department.

21. A peep at the claim statement exhibits that the workman has not mentioned any name of the junior whose service was retained at the time of terminating the workman's service. No such mention has taken place in his affidavit wherein he has simply stated that the junior persons to him are still working with the department. No documentary evidence could be led on this point. As such, the workman has failed to discharge the burden of this point, which is accordingly decided against him.

Point No. III

22. The Id. representative for the workman does not press this point.

Point No. V

23. The Id. representative for the non-applicants contends that subsequent to 29-2-92 the workman was not concerned with the department in any way and the case came up for adjudication in the year 2004 before this Tribunal after a lapse of 12 years and no explanation could be shown on behalf of the workman. On the contrary, the Id. representative for the workman contends that the workman raised the dispute in the year 2003 and on account of the delay alone his claim cannot be disallowed.

24. It is fairly well-settled law that when the relevant materials have been placed before the Tribunal to adjudicate the dispute, then merely on account of the delay the claim should not be rejected and the relief can be moulded by way of awarding the back-wages for the limited period. In the case on hand, all the materials have been brought on the record by both the parties which have been discussed in the aforesaid paragraphs. As such, on the sole ground of delay the claim of the workman cannot be declined and this point is decided against the non-applicants.

Point No. VI

25. The Id. representative for the non-applicants contends that the Census Department has a specific working and under the Census Act after every 10 years the census is being carried out by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, which is a sovereign function and this act cannot be done by the private agency, e.g. the defence. The State cannot delegate its power to be done by the private agency and referring to the orders Ex. M-1 and M-2, the Id. representative further contends that the posts of the casual workers were not of the regular nature and were created under the Non-Plan Expenditure and it was a sovereign work which does not fall under the provision of Section 2-J of the Act.

26. Per contra, the Id. representative for the workman contends that the services rendered by the non-applicant department specify the human wants and it comes within the fore corners of the provision under Section 2-J of the Act. The Id. representative placed his reliance upon 1978 LLJ SC 349.

27. The pertinent issue of the sovereign functions of the State cropped up before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 1978 LLJ SC 349 which was considered by the Hon'ble Court and the following observation was made on the point which is usefully quoted as below :—

"I would also like to make a few observations about the so called "sovereign" functions which have placed outside the field of industry. I do not feel happy about the use of the term "sovereign" here. I think that the term "Sovereign" should be reserved, technically and more correctly, for the sphere of ultimate decisions. Sovereignty operates on a sovereign plane of its own as I suggested in Keshvananda Bharati's case supported by a quotation from Ernest Barker's "Social and Political Theory". Again, the term "regal", from which the term "sovereign" functions appears to be derived, seems to be a misfit in a Republic where the citizen shares the political sovereignty in which he has even a legal share, however small, inasmuch as he exercise the right to vote. What is meant by the use of the term "sovereign", in relation to the activities of the State, is more accurately brought out by using the term "governmental" functions although there are difficulties here also in the much as the Government has entered largely now fields of industry. Therefore, only those services which are governed by separate rules and constitutional provisions, such as Arts. 310 and 311 should, strictly speaking, be excluded from the sphere of industry by necessary implication."

28. The submission made on behalf of the workman is fortified from decision supra and is sustainable. It is, therefore, held that the non-applicant department is an industry as defined under Section 2-J of the Act. This point is decided in favour of workman accordingly.

Relief

29. On conclusion, since the points No. I, II, III & IV have been decided against the workman, his claim deserves to be disallowed.

30. In the result, the reference is answered in the negative against the workman and in favour of the non-applicant department and it is held that the termination order dated 15-7-1996 passed by the non-applicant department against the workman is justified and legal and the claim of the workman is dismissed. An award is passed in these terms accordingly.

31. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

SCHEDULE

का.आ. 3613.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 32/1997) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/186/1996-आई आर (सी-II)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3613.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 32 of 1997) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Asansol as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Dhemomain Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-22012/186/1996-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
ASANSOL**

PRESENT :

SRI. MD. SARFARAZ KHAN, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. 32 OF 1997**PARTIES :**Agent, Dhemomain Colliery of ECL, Sitarampur,
Burdwan.

Vs.

General Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Union,
Asansol, Burdwan.**REPRESENTATIVES :**

For the management : None

For the union (Workman) : None

Industry : Coal State : West Bengal

Dated the 11-8-2005

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), Govt. of India through the Ministry of Labour vide its letter No. L-22012/186/96-IR(C- II) dated 20-5-1997 has been pleased to refer the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

"Whether the action of the management of Dhemomain Colliery in of M/s. E.C. Ltd., in dismissing Sh. Ramphal Jat, Ex-Havildar from services w.e.f. 29-7-93 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

On having received the order of reference No. L-22012/186/96-IR (C. II) dated 20-5-97 from the Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi a reference case No. 32 of 1997 was registered and an order to issue registered notice by post to the respective parties was passed which was accordingly issued with a direction to appear and file their written statement along with the list of the documents on 9-7-97 at 11-00 a.m.

It transpires on perusal of the record that both the parties in compliance of the registered notice appeared through their representatives on 25-8-97 and on their request the next date 13-10-97 was fixed for filing the written statement along with their documents. It further transpires from the record that after several adjournments written statement was filed on 22-12-97 by the side of the management along with the documents. The record further goes to show that union became absent and left taking any step since 9-2-98. It is also apparent that several times fresh notices were issued against the union but in spite of the receipt of the notice and thereafter grant of several adjournments the union did neither appear nor filed any written statement on its behalf in support of its case. The record was kept pending awaiting the appearance of the union till today i.e. 11-8-2005 but to no effect. Now the court feels that there is no propriety and justification in keeping the record any more pending as no useful purpose is to be served. The reference is also pending since the year 1997 due to non-taking interest of the union. As such it is hereby.

ORDERED

That let a "No Dispute Award" be and the same is passed. Send the copies of the award to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for information and needful. The reference is accordingly disposed off.

MD. SARFARAZ KHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3614.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 26/1992) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/416/1991-आई आर (सी-II)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3614.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 26 of 1992) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Asansol now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Parbelia Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-22012/416/1991-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ASANSOL

PRESENT : Sri. Md. Sarfaraz Khan,
Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. 26 OF 1992

PARTIES:

Agent, Parbelia Colliery of ECL, Neturia, Purulia
V/s.

General Secretary, West Bengal Khan Mazdoor Congress.

REPRESENTATIVES:

For the management : Sri P.K. Das

For the union (Workman) : None

Industry : Coal State : West Bengal

Dated the 11-8-2005

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), Govt. of India through the Ministry of Labour vide its letter No. L-22012/416/91 (IR-C. II) dated 16-06-1992 has been pleased to refer the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Parbelia Colliery in depriving Shri Lal Bachan Gope & 7 others (as per list at Annexure) by not giving promotion w.e.f. 31-1-1973 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman are entitled to?”

A reference of Order No. L-22012/416/91-IR (C. II) was received from the Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi for adjudication and accordingly notices were issued to the respective parties through the registered post directing them to appear in the court and file written statement along with the document in support of their claim. In pursuant to the notices both the parties appeared through their representatives and filed their written statement in support of their case.

On perusal of the record it transpires that the union is absent since 26-6-2002 and no step is being taken since then. Fresh notices were issued to the union which was duly received and served upon the union on 28-8-04 but in

spite of the receipt of the notice and having due knowledge about the pendency of the reference neither the union did come or take any step nor any information was sent to the court. It is apparent from the order sheet of the record that since last three years even in spite of due information no step is being taken by the union which is itself sufficient to conclude that the union has got no interest in this case and does not want to pursue the reference. In such circumstance it is not just, proper and advisable to keep this petty old reference of the year 1992 pending any more as no fruitful purpose is to be served. Accordingly it is hereby

ORDERED

that let a “No Dispute Award” be and the same is passed. Send the copies of the award to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi for information and needful. The reference is accordingly disposed off.

MD. SARFARAZ KHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3615.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एअर इंडिया लि., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नई दिल्ली-I के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 54/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल= 11012/15/2002-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3615.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 54/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi-I now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Air India Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-11012/15/2002-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

Presiding Officer : S.S. BAL

I.D. No. 54/2002

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Raj Kumar,
House No. 31/60, East Mehram Nagar,
Delhi Cantt.
New Delhi-110010

Workman

Versus

M/s. Air India Limited,
Through its General Manager (Personnel)
HRD Department,
Indira Gandhi International Airport,
New Delhi.

Management

APPEARANCES :

None for the Workman,
Shri G.S. Khalsa Assistant Manager,
for management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-11012/15/2002-IR (C-1) dated 25-7-2002 has referred the following industrial dispute to the Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Air India Ltd. IGI Airport Terminal-II, New Delhi in dismissing Sh. Raj Kumar, Hygenia attendant staff No. 31294 from services w.e.f. 6-4-2000 is justified and legal? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. Brief facts of this case as called from the record are that the petitioner joined Air India as Hygiene Attendant-III in Flight Service Department w.e.f. 1-9-1993 and was confirmed from 1-3-94 he used to do his job sincerely, obediently. It is further averred that the workman is staying in Delhi alongwith his family members and he is the eldest son in the family. He has got very small children. The workman's wife had undergone to major operation during delivery of child and she continues to bed ridden due to sickness. In these circumstances the workman had to look after children and to take his wife regularly to the hospital for treatment and on account of his being the sole person to look after his ailing wife and young kids he was forced to take leave while he was on duty but he could not inform the office and there was no one available in the vicinity and he was mentally upset and occupied in her treatment and look after the children for their food and shelter. It is further stated that due to this absence of the petitioner the respondent served a charge sheet dated 14-5-99 and constituted departmental enquiry. The Enquiry Officer induced him to admit his charge of misconduct assuring him that his misconduct would be leniently viewed. The workman had fallen prey to the it and admitted the charges levelled against him. He requested to take on record medical certificate about the treatment of ill-ness of his wife but enquiry officer asked him not to place all those things on the record as only the minor punishment is going to be imposed/inflicted and ultimately he received the dismissal letter dated 6-4-2000 from the respondent management. The workman impugnes the dismissal order on the following grounds : (a) that the enquiry was conducted in English. The workman is not good enough in English. His mother tongue is Hindi. (b) The enquiry officer himself presented the case. The respondent management did not appoint

any presenting officer (c) the workman was not allowed to bring competent person to represent his case; (d) the enquiry officer falsely assured the workman that if he voluntarily admitted the misconduct, he could escape from further mental trauma and only minor punishment of withholding two increments might be imposed; that his admission was not voluntary and was made on account of inducement by the E.O. as stated above. That medical certificate about ill-ness of his wife was not taken on record as stated above that the punishment of dismissal imposed by the management is serious. The disciplinary authority failed to objectively assess the extenuating circumstances pertaining to the workman. In view of the above circumstances he claims reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service.

3. The case has been contested by the management by filing reply that the workman was issued an explanation call letter with respect to refusal to do vacuum cleaning on flight and for further instigating the fellow staff. The workman was advised for unsatisfactory attendance record and was further advised to improve his attendance in future. The workman was advised vide letter dated 19-12-95 with respect to the unsatisfactory attendance. He was again advised vide letter dated 3-12-96 with respect to his poor attendance during the period 1-11-96 to 30-11-96. Again and again he was advised for unauthorised absence vide letter dated 19-5-97 and 6-8-98 and despite so many advises the workman continued to remain absent from time to time without any reason and he was again found absent without permission during the period August, 98 to December, 98 for 118 days. He again remained unauthorisedly absent from 2-1-99 and was advised to report for duty despite letter dated 4-5-99 reported for duty on 12-5-99 and did not offer any explanation which amounted to misconduct under the Certified Standing Order of the management and that is why he was charge-sheeted vide letter dated 14-5-99 with the following charges :

'Wilful disobedience of any lawful and reasonable orders of his superiors'

'Absence without leave'.

4. The workman was offered opportunity to submit explanation but did not submit any reply and the competent authority informed him vide letter dated 28-7-89 that it has been decided to hold an enquiry into the charges levelled against him. As such an enquiry committee was constituted vide order dated 28-7-99 and the enquiry committee held its proceedings from 6-6-99 to 31-8-99 in which the workman participated. In these proceedings he was given opportunity to engage defence counsel but the workman preferred to defend himself. During the enquiry proceedings the workman accepted the charges without coercion. After conclusion of proceedings the enquiry committee on scrutinising the evidence of the witness came to the conclusion that the workman was guilty of the charges that he was committing acts of misconduct and proposed

punishment of dismissal and which was accordingly awarded. Punishment is justified and the grounds of impugment of orders are denied and claim is sought to be dismissed as the workman is not entitled to any relief.

5. Written statement was followed by rejoinder wherein contents of the claim statement were reiterated as correct and controverted part of the written statement were repudiated. Thereafter matter was fixed for admission denial of documents. For the first time on 24-8-04 on which date workman was not present. However, the A/R for the management was present.

6. Then matter was adjourned to 3-11-04, 20-12-04 when workman filed documents then to 24-2-05 but the workman was not present and then to 28-4-04 when workman did not appear and thereafter the matter was again adjourned to 6-7-05 and then to 31-8-05. The workman was not present on the previous date and he is absent today also i.e. on 31-8-05. Thus perusal of record shows that the workman has not been appearing for the last four hearings. He has not sent any request for adjournment nor anybody on his behalf has appeared on the said dates. It appears that the workman is not taking interest in prosecution of this case. He has been very careless in attending proceedings and he has least interest in the prosecution of his claim and as such there is no justification to grant any further adjournment to the claimant. In these circumstances I find no justification to grant further adjournment the case. In my view the workman lost his right to contest this case as he has failed to appear despite so many opportunities including last opportunity. In the absence of any material to the contrary I have no option but to pass 'No Dispute Award in this case. File be consigned to record room.

S. S. BAL, Presiding Officer

आई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3616.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा. को. को. लि., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 145/1996) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/329/1995-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3616.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 145 of 96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of BCCL, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/329/1995-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
DHANBAD**

Present : Shri B. Biswas,
Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act., 1947

REFERENCE NO. 145 OF 1996

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of
Katras Area of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : Mr. S. N. Goswami,
Advocate.

On behalf of the employers : Mr. R. N. Ganguly,
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 30th August, 2005.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/329/95-IR (Coal-I), dt. 26th November, 1996.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of Mazdoor Sangathan Samitee for regularisation/employment of Shri Ganesh Chakravorty and 31 others (as per list enclosed on the roll of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. is justified? If so, to what relief are the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Case of the concerned workmen according to the Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union on their behalf in brief is as follows :—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workmen were absorbed by the management of Katras Choitudih Colliery under Katras Project as Tyndal in the year 1983 and since then the said workmen started performing their duties as job assignment of Tyndals/Heavy Tyndals/Tyndal Jamadar continuously. They submitted that since 1983 these workmen started performing the duties of Tyndal continuously in the underground mines and put their attendance for more than 190 days in each calendar year. They submitted that the Mining Engineer/A.C.M. Overman and other authorities used to supervise their work. They disclosed that in this way they worked upto 15-9-1994. The sponsoring union categorically reiterated that the concerned workmen were not the labours of contractor and for which they categorically denied the fact about discharging duties as Tyndal/Heavy Tyndals/Tyndal Jamadar being workers of the contractors. They submitted that as they continuously worked from 1983 to 15-9-94

they submitted representation to the management for their regularisation but as the management refused to consider their prayer they raised industrial dispute. They alleged that during hearing of the conciliation proceeding management illegally and arbitrarily stopped them from work. They submitted that as the conciliation proceeding failed this instant reference case was initiated by the Government. The sponsoring union accordingly submitted prayer to pass award directing the management to regularise the concerned workmen in the job of Tyndal.

3. Management on the contrary after filing written Statement-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workmen. They categorically submitted that the concerned workmen never worked under the management continuously against any permanent or regular post. Accordingly they submitted that question of supervision of their work by the officials of the management and or supply of tools and equipment to perform the job of Tyndal never arose. They also categorically denied the fact about payment of wages directly to the concerned workmen. They disclosed that no employer employee relationship ever existed between the management and the concerned workmen in dispute. They are rank outsiders and strangers and with mala fide intention they are trying to get their entry in the service of the company through litigation. They submitted that one of the concerned workmen Sheo Balak Paswan whose name is appearing in Sl. No. 32 of the list forwarded by the Ministry was in fact a contractor and was having licence under the provision of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act and he used to be awarded contract for certain urgent and emergent jobs which were not regular or permanent in nature. They further submitted that the job which used to be awarded to the contractor to perform were not at all any job fell under prohibited category. They submitted further that validity of the licence of the said contractor expired. Management accordingly advised him writing through letter dt. 3-9-94 to renew the licence but he failed to renew his licence and due to this reason he was not awarded any contract thereafter. In view of the facts and circumstances stated by the management they submitted that in no circumstances the concerned workmen are entitled to get any relief in view of their prayer and for which they submitted their prayer to reject the claim of the sponsoring union.

4. POINTS TO BE DECIDED

"Whether the demand of Mazdoor Sangathan Samitee for regularisation/employment of Shri Ganesh Chakravorty and 31 others (as per list enclosed on the roll of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited is justified? If so, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

4. FINDING WITH REASONS

5. It transpires from the record that the sponsoring union with a view to substantiate their claim examined two witnesses as WW-1 and WW-2 while management in support of their claim examined one witness as MW-1. WW-1 whose name is appearing in Sl. No. 32 of the list of workmen forwarded by the Ministry during his evidence disclosed that he started working at Katras Choitudih Colliery along with rest of the concerned workmen as Heavy Tyndal since 1984/85. This witness disclosed that to perform the said job of Tyndal management used to supply tools and equipments. He further disclosed that he was Tyndal Jamadar. Management used to pay wages to all the workmen to him for its disbursement. This witness admitted that after receipt of wages he used to disburse the same to other workmen. In support of his claim that they worked as Tyndal under the management he relied on certain document marked as Ext. W-1 and W-2 series. WW-2 i.e. Ganesh Chakravorty whose name is appearing in Sl. No. 1 of the list furnished by the Ministry along with order of reference during his evidence disclosed that they started working as Tyndal at Katras Choitudih Colliery since 1989. They disclosed that after they were engaged as Tyndal management posted them at Pit No. 2 in the underground in the same colliery. Sometimes they used to be engaged in Pit No. 1, 3, 6, 9 and 16. He further disclosed that they used to perform the job of Tyndal and the management used to supply them tools and equipments from the stores. This witness further disclosed that they used to put their attendance at Pit No. 2 and after receiving cap Lamp they were allowed to enter in the underground and used to take up work under direct supervision of the Engineer Incharge. To establish the claim that the concerned workmen worked directly under the management as Tyndal they relied on a letter dt. 14-7-94 issued by the Dy. CME/Agent, Katras Choitudih Colliery. On the contrary from the evidence of MW-1 I find quite a different picture. This witness during his evidence categorically denied the claim of the sponsoring union that the concerned workmen were engaged by the management to perform the job of Tyndal. This witness disclosed that with a view to undertake certain emergency job in the underground management used to engage licenced contractor Sheo Balak Paswan i.e. WW-1. This witness further submitted that as the licence of the said contractor had expired the Project Officer, Katras Choitudih Colliery issued a letter marked as Ext. M-1 asking him to submit valid licence for engagement of contract labours as per provision laid down in Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act within two days. But as he failed to submit that licence no further work was awarded to him as contractor. WW-2 during his evidence failed to produce any letter of appointment in support of their claim. The sponsoring union in support of the claim relied on a series of gate passes issued by the Mining Engineer during evidence of WW-1 were marked as Ext. W-1. From these gate passes it transpires that time to time

equipments and tools were allowed to take inside mines issued by the stores. From these gate passes I do not find the name of any single workman to show that the same were issued in their names. From stores requisition slip it transpires that Sheo Balak Paswan submitted some requisition slips for issuance of certain equipment of tools from the stores. Excepting the name of Sheo Balak Paswan I do not find the name of any other workmen in the said requisition slip. It is the specific claim of the sponsoring union that the concerned workmen were absorbed by the management to work as Tyndal at Katras Chaitudih colliery in the year 1983. WW-1 during his evidence disclosed that in the year 1984-85 they were engaged by the management to work as Tyndal while WW-2 during his evidence disclosed that they started working as Tyndal being engaged by the management in the year 1989. The sponsoring union in course of hearing relied on a certificate issued by the Dy. CME/Agent in the name of Sheo Balak Paswan Tyndal Jamadar and 75 workmen to the effect that those workmen were engaged to perform duties at Katras Chaitudih colliery under Katras Project area, BCCL of the job assignment for transporting from surface to underground since 1992 and still in existence. The certificate further shows that they have qualified for members of C.M.P.F. on verification of their attendance and marked found more than 190 days in each calendar year. Therefore, if these facts are taken into consideration it will expose clearly that while the sponsoring union asserted engagement of the concerned workmen by the management to work in the post of Tyndal since 1983, WW-1 disclosed that they were engaged to take up such work by the management in the year 1984-85 while WW-2 disclosed that they were engaged by the management to work as such from 1989. The Dy. C.M.E. exceeding further disclosed that Sheo Balak Paswan and 75 workmen started working at Katras Chaitudih Colliery since 1992. Therefore, burden of proof rests on the sponsoring union to establish actually from which year the concerned workmen were engaged by the management to work as Tyndal. The representative of the concerned workman during extending his argument as failed to give any satisfactory explanation relating to serious contradiction appearing in the matter of engagement of the concerned workmen as Tyndal by the management as discussed above. The Dy. C.M.E. exceeding further disclosed that the names Sheo Balak Paswan and 75 workmen were enrolled in the year C.M.P.F. record as they performed their duties for more than 190 days continuously since 1992. In spite of claiming so the sponsoring union have failed to produce any C.M.P.F. record to show that deduction of C.M.P.F. from the wages of the concerned workmen were actually made. WW-2 during his evidence remained silent from whom they used to draw wages for discharging their duties as Tyndal. On the contrary WW-1 who claim himself as Tyndal Jamadar during his evidence categorically disclosed that management used to pay him wages for its disbursement to the concerned workmen and

accordingly he used to disburse the wages to them. Obviously said WW-1 preserved records to prove disbursement of wages to the concerned workmen which he used to receive from the management. During hearing the sponsoring union failed to produce any such record in support of such claim of WW-1.

It is the specific claim of the sponsoring union that the concerned workmen started working as Tyndal being absorbed by the management in the year 1983. Therefore, it has to be presumed according to Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union that they were absorbed being regular workers. Therefore, they are entitled to get all privileges like regular workers. But the sponsoring union have failed to produce neither any letter of appointment No I.D. Card issued in favour of the said workmen. They also have failed to produce any wage sheet showing payment of wages to them. On the contrary if the evidence of WW-1 is taken into consideration in that case it proves clearly that he used to draw wages of the workmen from the management for its disbursement. It is the specific claim of the management that they used to engage said WW-1 as contractor to perform certain job in case of emergency and which were not of prohibited categories on the basis of valid licence. They further disclosed that as the licence of the said contractor expired they issued a letter dt. 31-8-94/3-9-94 marked as Ext. M-1 asking him to produce valid licence for engagement of contract labour. They submitted that as the contractor WW-1 failed to produce any such valid licence, they did not allot further job to him being a contractor. Ld. Advocate for the management submitted categorically that there is no provision in the administration of the management to pay wages to regular workers without any wage slip. Ld. Advocate further submitted that there is no provision at all to hand over the wages to a group of workmen or to a particular workman for its disbursement. Accordingly they submitted that the fact which WW-1 disclosed during his evidence finds no basis at all. It is the specific claim of the sponsoring union that the concerned workmen were absorbed by the management to perform the job of Tyndals in the year 1983. It is their further contention that from 1983 to 15-9-1994 these workmen continuously worked under the management and put their attendance for more than 190 days in each year. They submitted further that as the concerned workmen placed their demand for their regularisation management stopped them from work. When it is the claim of the sponsoring union that management absorbed the concerned workmen as Tyndal I have failed to understand how question of their regularisation comes in. Therefore, it is clear that they were not actually absorbed by the management to discharge such duties. Burden of proof accordingly rests on the sponsoring union to establish that the concerned workmen started working under the management since 1983. In view of my discussion above it has been exposed very clearly that the sponsoring

union has failed to produce a single scrap of paper in support of their claim. On the contrary if evidence of WW-2 is taken into consideration it definitely has vitiated the claim of the sponsoring union that the concerned workmen were absorbed by the management to work as Tyndal in the year 1983. Claim of the sponsoring union further vitiated if the certificate issued by Dy. C.M.E. is taken into consideration. If all these facts are taken into consideration I find no hesitation to say that the sponsoring union with some otherwise intention raised industrial dispute with a prayer for regularisation of the concerned workmen from 1983 though it is very much apparent that they never started working from the said period. As the claim of the sponsoring union appears to be based on the footing which is not at all believable, in view of my discussion above, they are not entitled to get any relief. In the result, the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief. Accordingly the following award is rendered :—

"The demand of Mazdoor Sangathan Samites for regularisation/employment of Shri Ganesh Chakraborty and 31 others (as per list enclosed) on the roll of M/s. BCCL is not justified. Consequently, the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief."

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

Sl. No.	Name	Father's Name
1	2	3
1.	Ganesh Chakraborty	Late Kalachand Chakraborty
2.	Ramkrishna Singh	Sri Jadunandan Singh
3.	Singhwar Paswan	Sri Besewar Paswan
4.	Kapil Paswan	Sri Jagdish Paswan
5.	Ramprakash Singh	Sri Shivnandan Singh
6.	Abdesh Paswan	Sri Baijnath Paswan
7.	Rajnandan Paswan	Sri Chhotan Paswan
8.	Ramniwas Singh	Sri Sidheswar Singh
9.	Ratan Kumar Paswan	Sri Basdeo Paswan
10.	Sultan Ansari	Sri Gafur Ansari
11.	Janki Singh	Late Shublal Singh
12.	Rajendra Saw	Sri Tiwari Saw
13.	Ramashray Paswan	Sri Ramsarup Paswan
14.	Gajadhar Yadav	Sri Karu Yadav
15.	Krishnadeo Paswan	Sri Karan Paswan
16.	Raghunandan Paswan	Sri Showran Paswan
17.	Ramchalitar Singh	Late Shublal Singh
18.	Mathura Paswan	Sri Dwarik Paswan
19.	Bharath Rewani	Sri Ragho Rewani
20.	Girani Das	Late Nanhak Das
21.	Bisheshwar Paswan	Sri Laxman Paswan

1	2	3
22.	Rameshwar Saw	Sri Mahabir Saw
23.	Surendra Paswan	Sri Dukhi Paswan
24.	Narad Dusadh	Late Aklu Dusadh
25.	Dilip Paswan	Sri Jagdish Paswan
26.	Umesh Yadav	Sri Dahu Yadav
27.	Rajnandan Saw	Sri Tiwari Saw
28.	Rajdeo Paswan	Sri Showran Paswan
29.	Pradip Paswan	Sri Shibcharan Paswan
30.	Ramesh Prasad	Sri Dukhan Prasad
31.	Radhey Mahato	Sri Permishwar Mahato
32.	Shibalak Paswan (Myself)	Sri Bisheshwar Paswan.

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3617.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14), की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा. को. लि., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/त्रय न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 123/1996) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/286/1995-आई आर (सी.डी.)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3617.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 123 of 96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of BCCL, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/286/95-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Present : B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 123 OF 1996

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of
Kusunda Area of M/s. BCCL and their
workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : Mr. S. N. Goswami
Advocate.

On behalf of the employers : Mr. D. K. Verma,
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 30th August, 2005.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1) (d) of the I. D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/286/95-IR (Coal-I), dt. the 3rd October, 1996.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand for employment to dependent of Shri Johan Mohammed under the provisions of para 9-4-3 of NCWA-IV by the Union is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?”

2. Case of the concerned workman according to Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows :—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workman Johan Mohammed was the permanent employee of Godhur Colliery under Kusunda Area as Underground Pump Operator. They submitted that during rendering his service under the management he became a patient of Leprosy and for which he had to remain under treatment at Nirmala Leprosy Hospital Govindpur till 29-10-93. They submitted that Dr. B. P. Dey, C.M.O. of that hospital declared the concerned workman not fit for his job and for which he advised him to remain on treatment regularly. They submitted further that during course of treatment the concerned workman submitted several representations to the management with prayer for sending him to Apex Medical Board for assessment of his disability which he sustained as a result of being a Leprosy patient but the management did not pay any attention to consider his prayer. They further submitted that the concerned workman remained on duty till 29-10-93 officially and thereafter he was stopped from duty as he was not capable at all to perform his job being a Leprosy patient. Accordingly he further submitted representation to the management to provide employment to one of his dependant as per the provision contained under clause 9.4.3 of NCWA-IV but the management did not consider his prayer ignoring the provision as laid down under clause 9.4.3 of NCWA-IV. Accordingly he raised an industrial dispute through sponsoring union for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for adjudication. The sponsoring union accordingly submitted prayer to pass award directing the management to provide employment to one dependent son of the concerned workman as per clause 9.4.3 of NCWA IV.

3. Management on the contrary after filling Written Statement-cum-reply have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of the concerned

workmen. They submitted that the concerned workman was a permanent worker under the management and as per Company's record his date of birth was 14-7-84. and he was scheduled to be superannuated with effect from 15-7-94. They submitted further that upto the month of December, 1993 the concerned workman satisfactorily performed his duty and gave 25 to 26 days attendance in each month. He put similar attendance upto the end of March, 1994 and to set his dependent employed after declaring himself to be medically unfit he started asking for grant of sick leave. As he was on the verge of retirement w.e.f. 15-7-94 management adjusted his leave and he was on leave for the period till his retirement. The categorically submitted that the services of the concerned workman was not terminated on the ground of medical unfitness and he continued to be on the roll of the company till the date of his superannuation. They further submitted that as the concerned workman was allowed to continue in the employment till the date of his retirement there as no question of providing employment to his dependent under compassionate ground or under any provision of law. They disclosed that employment on compassionate ground only arises when the services of a workman is terminated on the ground of his medical unfitness and he is debarred from earning wages at the time of his career. This principle cannot be constituted conferring right on each and every workman to get himself declared sick and to remain absent for future months at the fag end of his retirement. Accordingly they submitted that the demand of the sponsoring union is without any merit and for which they submitted prayer to pass award rejecting the claim of the concerned workman.

4. POINTS TO BE DECIDED

“Whether the demand for employment to dependent of Shri Johan Mohammed under the provisions of para 9.4.3 of NCWA-IV by the Union is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?”

5. FINDING WITH REASONS

It transpires from the record that the sponsoring Union with a view to substantiate their claim examined one witness as WW-1. Management also in support of their claim examined one witness as MW-1. Considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides and considering the evidence of WW-1 and MW-1 there is no dispute to hold that the concerned workman was underground Pump Operator at Godhur Colliery under Kusunda area. WW-1 during his evidence disclosed that the concerned workman since 1989 was a Leprosy patient and since 1990 he became unfit to render his duty for his ailment. This witness further submitted that he was under treatment of Nirmala Leprosy Hospital, Govindpur, WW-1 during his evidence relied on a certificate issued by Dr. B.P. Dey of Nirmala Hospital Govindpur in support of the claim that the concerned workman was not fit for his job. The said certificate during his evidence was marked as Ext. W-1. This certificate was issued by the said doctor on

29-10-1993 but did not disclose actually from which period he is under treatment being a Leprosy patient. WW-1 disclosed that as the concerned workman was incapable to work he submitted several representations to the management with prayer for sending him to the Apex Medical Board to assess the extent of the disability sustained by him which caused him unfit to render his duty. But the management did not consider his prayer and as a result of which he stopped attending his duty w.e.f. 29-10-93. During this period the witness submitted that the concerned workman filed representations with prayer for employment of one of his dependent on compassionate ground but that too was not considered by the management. MW-1 during his evidence disclosed that as per Company's record date of birth of the concerned workman was recorded as 14-7-34 and accordingly as per service condition he was liable to be superannuated with effect from 15-7-94. This witness further disclosed that in the month of March, 1994 he submitted a petition with prayer for employment of his son on the ground of his medical unfitness and he started absenting from duty thereafter. However, as the leave was at his credit the said absence from duty by the concerned workman was adjusted from his leave account. This witness further disclosed that as per administrative circular a workman should possess atleast 2 years of service before the date of his superannuation for consideration of his prayer for employment of one of his dependent on compassionate ground. In support of this claim management relied on the provision as laid down under clause 9.4.0 of NCWA-VI. They categorically denied the fact that the management intentionally did not provide employment to the dependent son of the concerned workman inspite of knowing the fact that he was not medically fit. The claim of the management is further that as such application was submitted by the concerned workman at the fag end of his service complying the provision as laid down in NCWA-VI there is no scope to provide employment to one of his dependent on compassionate ground. MW-1 during his evidence categorically denied the fact that the concerned workman was a Leprosy patient since 1990. He admitted that the management sanctioned special leave to the workman in case of certain disease viz. Leprosy, T.B. Heart diseases, Paralysis. When a workman is allowed special leave on the ground mentioned above he is also entitled to get 50% wages for a period of 6 months subject to maximum of one year. Clause 9.4 of NCWA-VI speaks clearly that management may consider employment to one dependent of worker who is permanently disabled in his place subject to the condition that such disablement should arise out of general physical debility so certified by the Coal Company. The employee concerned will be eligible for the benefit under this clause if he/she is upto the age of 58 years. Therefore, as per this claim question of providing compassionate employment arises to any dependant of the workman if such permanent disablement is detected before attaining the age of 58 years. It is the contention of

the concerned workman that he started suffering from Leprosy since 1989 and he consulted doctor of Nirmal Leprosy Hospital for his treatment. WW-1 during his evidence relied on the certificate issued by Dr. B.P. Day, marked as Ext. W-1. The said certificate was issued on 29-10-93. From this certificate it transpires that the doctor declared the concerned workman not fit for any job but the certificate remains silent actually from which period he was not in a position to take up his normal work. It is the contention of the sponsoring union that when the concerned workman was detected as Leprosy patient he submitted several representations to the management for sending him to the Apex Medical Board to assess the extent of his disability which caused unfit to remain in work. But management did not consider necessary to take any step inspite of submitting said representations. It is really curious to note that inspite of claiming so in course of hearing either the concerned workman or the sponsoring union did not consider necessary to submit a single copy of representation original of which was submitted to the management. Untill and unless this fact is established just on the basis of verbal submission I find it difficult to give much importance on such claims. Management on the contrary submitted that upto the month of December, 1993 the concerned workman remained on duty in usual course and put his attendance for 25/26 days in each and every month. Thereafter he stopped attending his work and submitted representation for providing employment to one of his dependent on compassionate ground as per provision under clause 9.4.3. of NCWA VI. It is the contention of the management that due date of superannuation of the concerned workman was 15-7-94. They further submitted that just three months before his superannuation as the concerned workman submitted such representation it was not possible on their part to provide any employment on compassionate ground to one of his dependant. They submitted that before providing such employment on compassionate ground it has to be taken into consideration that the concerned workman was actually declared disabled by the Apex Medical Board. As there was no such report just on the basis of such representation his claim could not be considered at all. I do not like to raise any dispute that the concerned workman was a Leprosy patient but the point to be considered is that whether he was actually suffering from such ailment since 1989. It is also to be looked into if during 1990 or 1991 he was actually incapable to perform his duties regularly. Inspite of getting ample scope excepting the certificate marked as Ext. W-1 the sponsoring union has failed to produce a single scrap of paper to show that the concerned workman was a Leprosy patient since 1989 and he remained under treatment at Nirmala Leprosy Hospital since from the said period. They had the scope to produce necessary medical papers in support of his treatment but they did not consider necessary to produce the same. There is no dispute at all that there is a scheme on the part of the management to

pay 50% wages upto the period of one year if remained under treatment being Leprosy patient. No evidence is forthcoming on the part of the sponsoring union to the effect that being a Leprosy patient he was under leave and enjoyed the scheme as mentioned above. It is the specific contention of the management that upto the end of December, 1993 the concerned workman very much performed his duty. They submitted that if the concerned workman was actually unfit to perform his duty it was not possible on his part to give his attendance during the said period. When there is a provision for providing employment on compassionate ground if a workman is declared disabled burden of proof rests on the sponsoring union to establish that the concerned workman was actually disabled before attaining age of 58 years but the management ignoring his disability forced him to perform his duty. Leprosy is such type of ailment that his co-worker would not allow that worker to remain in job. When the concerned workman is suffering from such serious ailment and when he was actually disabled to perform his job why he remained silent at that time. I have also failed to understand why the sponsoring union also remained silent about the claim of the concerned workman without raising any dispute before attaining the age of 58 years to send the concerned workman to the Apex Medical Board for his medical examination with a view to assess if he was actually disabled or not to perform his duties.

There is no dispute to hold that as per NCWA management is liable to provide employment on compassionate ground to any dependant of the worker if the said worker is declared to be disabled by the Apex Medical Board and also if other conditions are fulfilled. In spite of knowing the said provision of NCWA I find no hesitation to say that the sponsoring union did not proceed with the case of the concerned workman properly. On the contrary they started agitating for employment of one dependent son of the concerned workman on compassionate ground at the fag end of his service. NCWA has clearly pointed out that such employment only could be given before attaining the age of 58 years by any worker. As the sponsoring union has failed to establish that before attaining age of 58 year they raised such dispute there is no scope to consider claim of the concerned workman for providing employment to one of his son. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above I hold that the sponsoring union has lamentably failed to establish the claim of the concerned workman for which the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief in view of his prayer. In the result following Award is rendered :—

“The demand for employment to dependent of Shri John Mohammed under the provision of para 9.4.3 of NCWA-IV by the union is not justified. Consequently, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief.”

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3618.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई सी एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 9/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/478/95-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3618.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 9/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure, in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of ECL, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/478/95-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Present : B. Biswas,
Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 9 of 1997

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of
Mugma Area of M/s. ECL and their workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : Mr. A.K. Sinha, Ld.
Advocate;

On behalf of the employers : Mr. B.M. Prasad, Ld.
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 22nd August, 2005.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in
exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section

10(1) (d) of the I. D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/478/95-IR (Coal-I), dated, the 9th/10 January, 1996.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Mugma Area of M/s. E.C.L., in denial of pay protection in respect of S/Shri Tikko Mahato, Basudeo Roy and Tulsi Gope is justified? If not, to what relief are concerned workman entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workmen according to Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union on their behalf in brief is as follows :—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workmen were employed by the management as Time Rated workers in Group VA wages at Shampur A Colliery under Mugma Area. They submitted that management vide office Order No. ECL/AGENT/Shampur/P/93/2955 dt. 14-11-91 issued by the CME/AGENT, Shampur Colliery designated the concerned workmen as Time Rated workers decreasing their wages. They disclosed that by the said order concerned workmen Tikko Mahato was designated as Timber Mazdoor in Cat. II while concerned workmen Basudeo Roy and Tulsi Gope were designated as Dresser in Cat. III. As a result the service condition of those workmen were changed in violation of Sec. 9-A of the I.D. Act. They alleged that management changed the designation and service condition of those workmen without getting any option from them as they never applied for changing their service condition from PR to TR. As a result they raised their protest before the management against changing of their service conditions to no effect and for which they raised Industrial Dispute before ALC(C), Dhanbad for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The sponsoring union accordingly on behalf of the concerned workmen submitted prayer to pass award directing the management for pay protection of their wages from 14-11-91 to till date.

3. Management on the contrary after filling Written Statement-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workmen.

They submitted that the concerned workmen approached the management for their correction from the status of Piece Rated workers to Time Rated workers. They disclosed that time rated jobs are offered to the workmen according to the skill possessed by them to perform various unskilled and skilled jobs from Cat. I to Cat. VI. As the concerned workmen's skill were adjudged they were offered the jobs which could be performed by them on the basis of their skill. They were fixed in the Categories with initial

starting on the scale of pay fixed for that category subject to condition of promotion to higher category after they gain experience, skill to perform highest category of jobs.

They further submitted that question of protection of Piece Rated wages can not be granted to a Time Rated workers because the person performing the unskill or semi-skill jobs after conversion can not supersede the workmen performing skilled and highly skilled jobs under whom the concerned workmen deputed to work on such jobs.

They submitted that as the concerned workmen gave their consent they were converted to time rated workers from Piece rated workers in the year 1991 and after a lapse of long years they have raised the dispute without raising any question when they were continued to T.R. workers. They submitted that as the demand of the concerned workmen is baseless they are not entitled to get any relief in view of their prayers.

4. POINTS TO BE DECIDED

"Whether the action of the mangement of Mugma Area of M/s E.C.L. in denial of pay protection in respect of S/Shri Tikko Mahato, Basudeo Roy and Tulsi Gope is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

5. FINDING WITH REASONS

It transpires from the record that the sponsoring Union with a view to substantiate the claim of the concerned workmen examined two workmen as W.W. I and W.W.2 while management did not adduce any evidence in support of their claims.

Considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides, evidence of W.W. I and W.W. 2 and documents on record there is no dispute to hold that concerned workmen were Piece Rated workers in Gr. V-A wages at Shampur-'A' Colliery under Mugma Area. It is admitted fact that out of those three concerned workmen Tikko Mahato was regularised as Timber Mazdoor in Cat. II while workmen Basudeo Roy and Tulsi Gope were regularised as 'Dresser' in Cat. III from their status of piece rated workers. The office order relating to conversion of the concerned workmen from "Piece rated" to "Time Rated" category during evidence of W.W. I was marked as Exht. W-I. It transpires that the said office order was issued by the management on 14-11-91.

The allegation of the sponsoring union is that as a result of that order of conversion from PR to TR their wages were fixed in the initial stage of the scale of pay without giving any pay protection of the wages which they used to receive as P.R. workers in Group V-A. They alleged that for the said arbitrary decision of the management the concerned workmen not only sustained financial loss but also without giving any notice u/s 9-A of the Industrial Disputes Act they changed their service condition and for

which they submitted representation to the management placing their demand for pay protection though their such demand was denied by the management.

In course of hearing the sponsoring union have failed to produce a single scrap of paper to show that after issuance of that order (Exht. W-I) the concerned workmen submitted representation with demand for their pay protection. On the contrary it is the contention of the management that question of pay protection of piece rated workers cannot be considered on their conversion to time rated workers as because of the fact that the persons who are unskilled or semi-skilled cannot supersede the wages of the skilled workers working as Time Rated workers and for that reason when any workman is converted as TR worker from P. R. worker his wages is fixed in the initial stage of the scale of wages offered to him. It is their further contention that the concerned workmen were converted to time rated workers by the said office order after consent was given by them. Accordingly, when after getting consent from those workers the said order was issued, there is no scope to say that violating the provision Sec. 9 of the I.D. Act their service condition were changed.

The office order (Exht. W-I) shows clearly that it was issued on 14-11-91 and by the said order as many as 33 Piece Rated workers were converted to Time Rated workers. In the said order it has been clearly mentioned that the Piece Rated workers converted to Time Rated workers will be paid the initial basic of the category in which they have been regularised. This office order does not indicate that its acceptance was mandatory. There was no hindrance on the part of the concerned workmen to remain as Piece Rated workers without accepting that order. It is seen that they accepted the said order knowing fully well about the condition where their initial wage will be fixed on accepting the said order of conversion. They have failed to adduce any evidence to show that if management offered pay protection to other Time Rated workers on their conversion from Piece Rated workers arbitrarily ignoring their claim. W.W. 1 as well as W.W. 2 during evidence admitted that wages of Piece Rated workers are variable and it depends upon the work load. They admitted that wages of Piece Rated workers are given according to the capacity of the work to be done by a workman and such assessment of work is done considering how many tubs a Piece Rated worker loads every day. W.W. 1 as well as W.W. 2 in course of their evidence though disclosed that on conversion of Time Rated worker from the status of Piece Rated, their wages were fixed on the basis of combination of manual work done by skilled and unskilled workman in Cat. I to Cat. VI have failed to produce any authentic document in support of such claim. On the contrary it has been emphatically submitted by the management that in case of conversion of Piece Rated to Time Rated the wage is fixed at the initial stage of scale of pay of Time Rated worker in the category where the worker has been placed to see that

the wages on conversion of a worker to Time Rated does not supersede the wages of skilled workers working in Time Rated. They further submitted that as wages of Piece Rated workers varies time to time on the basis of work performed by them, there is no scope to fix their wages in Time Rated replying on the said variable wages.

As per N.C.W.A. IV rate of wages of the Piece Rated worker was Rs. 43.31 and full back wages was Rs. 43.31 while after revision of wages as per N.C.W.A. rate of wages of the Piece Rated worker was fixed at Rs. 72.03 and full back wages was fixed on Rs. 72.03. The said revised rate came into effect on and from 1-7-91.

The concerned workmen were converted from Piece Rated to Time Rated in Cat. II & III with effect from 14-11-91. Therefore as per revised wages in Piece Rated their wages fixed at Rs. 72.03. After conversion to Time Rated workers, Tikka Mahato was placed in Cat. II while Basudeo Roy and Tulsi Gope were placed in Cat. III.

After revision of wages as per N.C.W.A. w.e.f. 1-7-91 the wages in Cat. II was fixed at Rs. 76.89 while the wages in Cat. II was fixed at Rs. 79.24. Therefore it is clear that after conversion to Time Rated workers their initial wages were fixed at Rs. 76.89 and Rs. 79.24 respectively which was higher than the rate of wages of the Piece Rated workers. It is admitted fact that wages of Piece Rated workers are variable and that variation depends upon the work performed by them. When minimum wages was fixed at Rs. 72.03 a Piece Rated worker is eligible to earn more if he takes extra workload. It is not expected that extra wages which a Piece Rated worker earns will add to his basic wages on his conversion to Time Rated worker in the shape of pay protection. It is to be borne into mind that position of Piece Rated worker is stagnant as there is no promotional avenue to them while a Time Rated worker is very much eligible to get his promotion upto Cat. VI and more if he performs well. Therefore the status and position of a Piece Rated worker cannot be equated with the status and position of a Time Rated worker.

Considering all facts & circumstances discussed there is sufficient reason to hold that the claim of the concerned workman finds no stable footing to consider and for which there is no scope to say that management took any arbitrary decision refusing their demand for pay protection when they were converted to Time Rated workers to Piece Rated workers.

In the result the following award is rendered :

"That the action of the management of Mugma Area of M/s. BCCL in denial of pay protection in respect of S/Shri Tikka Mahato, Basudeo Roy and Tulsi Gope is justified. Accordingly, the concerned workmen named above are not entitled to get any relief.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Off

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3619.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 292/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/378/2001-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3619.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 292/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 13-09-2005.

[No. L-20012/378/2001-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Reference No. 292 of 2004

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of P.B. Area of M/s. BCCL and their workman

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. H. Nath, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 22nd August, 2005.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/378/2001-I.R. (C-I) dated, the 7th November, 2001.

SCHEDULE

"kya Bharat Coking Coal Limited P.B. Kshetra key pravandhtantra द्वारा Shri Baban Bhuia ko dinank 27-11-97 sey barkhast kiya jana uchit, vidhibat evam naya sangat hai? Yadi nahi to karmkar kis rahat key patra hai?"

2. Case of the concerned workman according to Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows:—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workman was a Miner/Loader in Kachhi Balihari 5/6 pits Colliery under Putkee Balihari Area of M/s BCCL. They submitted that the concerned workman fell ill suddenly and remained under treatment of a local doctor. They submitted further that this fact was duly intimated to the management orally by his family members but inspite of giving due intimation management issued chargesheet to him. Inspite of giving reply to the said chargesheet management without accepting the same initiated domestic enquiry against him and thereafter dismissed him from his service w.e.f. 27-11-97 illegally, arbitrarily and violating the principle of natural justice. After the said order of dismissal the concerned workman approached the management for his reinstatement in his service but to no effect and for which he raised an industrial dispute before the ALC(C), Dhanbad for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for adjudication. The sponsoring union accordingly submitted prayer to pass Award directing the management to reinstate the concerned workman with effect from the date of his dismissal after giving aside the same with full back wages and other consequential benefit.

3. Management on the contrary after filing written Statement-cum-Rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workman. They submitted that the management issued chargesheet to the concerned workman on the ground of his absents from duty unauthorisedly. Reply given by the concerned workman as was not satisfactory they initiated domestic enquiry against him and the Enquiry Officer after conducting the said domestic enquiry submitted his report holding the concerned workman guilty to the charges. They submitted further that relying on the said enquiry report of the Enquiry Officer and also considering all material aspects the Disciplinary Authority dismissed the concerned workman from service with effect from 27-11-97. They submitted that the Disciplinary authority did not commit any illegality or took any arbitrary decision in dismissing the concerned workman from his service and for which the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief. Accordingly management submitted prayer to pass Award rejecting the claim of the concerned workman.

4. POINTS TO BE DECIDED

"kya Bharat Coking Coal Limited P.B. Kshetra key pravandhtantra द्वारा Shri Baban Bhuia ko dinank 27-11-97 sey barkhast kiya jana uchit, vidhibat evam naya sangat hai? Yadi nahi to karmkar kis rahat key patra hai?"

5. FINDING WITH REASONS

It transpires from the record that before taking up hearing of this case into merit it was taken into consideration if domestic enquiry held against the concerned workman was fair, proper and in accordance with the principle of natural justice. Said issue on preliminary point was disposed

vide order No. 11 dtd. 18-10-2004 in favour of the management. Now the point for consideration is if the management have been able to substantiate the charge brought against the concerned workman and if so whether there is any scope to review the said order of dismissal issued against the concerned workman by the Disciplinary Authority under Section 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947.

6. Considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings and also considering the materials on record there is no dispute to hold that the concerned workman was a Miner Loader posted at Kachhi Balihari 5/6 pits Colliery under Putkee Balihari area of M/s. BCCL. During evidence of MW-1 the chargesheet which was issued to the concerned workman marked as Ext. M-1. From the chargesheet it transpires that the concerned workman remained himself absent from duty without giving any intimation or information and taking any prior permission from the management from 24-4-97. The chargesheet was issued on 10-7-97. Therefore, it is seen that the concerned workman remained himself on unauthorised absence for a period of 2½ months. It is the contention of the sponsoring union that the concerned workman as was lying ill, could not attend to his duty and remained under treatment of the local doctor. This fact was duly intimated to the management orally by the family member of the concerned workman. It is admitted fact that after receipt of the said chargesheet the concerned workman submitted his reply which during evidence of MW-1 was marked as Ext. M-2. From the reply given by the concerned workman it transpires that he fell ill with effect from 24-4-97 and remained under treatment of the local doctor and he further submitted that as he was lying ill he could not give any intimation to the management. In support of his claim the concerned workman relied on the Medical certificate issued by the Medical practitioner. This certificate shows that the concerned workman was under his treatment from 26-4-97 to 10-7-97. From the enquiry proceeding papers it transpires that the concerned workman not only remained present during hearing of the enquiry proceeding but also defended his case. Concerned workman also at the time of hearing of the enquiry proceeding gave his statement to the Enquiry Officer which was duly recorded by him. The facts disclosed before the Enquiry Officer by the concerned workman is of like nature of the facts which he submitted in his reply to the chargesheet. Therefore, considering reply given by the concerned workman and considering the statement it transpires clearly that for his illness he could not attend to his duty during the period in question and in support of his claim he relied on the Medical certificate issued by the Medical practitioner. Concerned workman, however, admitted in course of his giving statement before the enquiry officer that as he was not aware of the procedure, he could not give due intimation well ahead before the management, and for which he begged apology.

The enquiry officer after completing enquiry submitted his report which during evidence of MW-1 was marked as Ext. M-8. From the enquiry report it transpires that the Enquiry Officer found the concerned workman guilty to the charges as he remained himself absent more than 10 days without giving any intimation to the

management. It transpires further from his finding that he discussed about the Medical certificate issued by the Medical practitioner under whom the concerned workman remained treatment but did not draw any conclusion whether he believed that Medical certificate as genuine one or not. As per clause 26.1.1 of the Certified Standing Order speaks that it amounts to misconduct if a workman was found habitual late attendance or wilful or habitual absence from duty without sufficient cause. The enquiry officer in his finding observed that he found the concerned workman guilty to the charges as he remained himself absent from duty for more than 10 days without permission or sufficient cause. It is fact that the concerned workman remained himself absent without giving any intimation or taking prior permission from the management for more than 2½ month. The reason which the concerned workman assigned during giving his statement or in his reply to the chargesheet is not sufficient enough to accept. Accordingly I hold that the management was justified in issuance of chargesheet against the concerned workman relying on clause 26-1-1 of the Certified Standing Order.

It is seen that relying on the enquiry report and also other materials on record the Disciplinary authority dismissed the concerned workman from his service. Now the point for consideration is if there is any scope to review the order of dismissal issued against the concerned workman by the management under Section 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947 Section 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947 speaks as follows :—

“Where an industrial dispute relating to the discharge or dismissal of a workman has been referred to a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal for adjudication and, in the course of the adjudication proceedings, the Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal, as the case may be, is satisfied that the order of discharge or dismissal was not justified, it may, by its award, set aside the order of discharge or dismissal and direct reinstatement of the workman on such terms and conditions if any, as it thinks fit, or give such other relief to the workman including the award of any lesser punishment in lieu of discharge or dismissal as the circumstances of the case may require.”

Therefore, according to this provision it has to be looked into if the said order of dismissal issued by the Disciplinary authority was justified and proportionate to the misconduct committed by the concerned workman. It transpires from the record that the management issued chargesheet to the concerned workman with direction to submit his reply within three days from the date of receipt of the said chargesheet. As per clause 27.2 where a workman is charged with a misconduct which may lead to the imposition of a major penalty, he shall be informed in writing of the allegations against him and shall be given an opportunity to explain his conduct within a period of 7 days. Major penalty has been detailed under clause 29.1(ii). According to this provision (a) stoppage of increment, (b) reduction to a lower grade or post or a stage in a time scale, and (c) dismissal or discharge from service comes under major penalty. Therefore, before imposition of major penalty management is liable to give at least 7 days notice to the

workman as per provision laid down under clause 27.2 of the Certified Standing Order. Here in the instant case the Disciplinary authority issued chargesheet to the concerned workman with direction to give his reply within 3 days. Therefore the very intention of the Disciplinary authority was not to impose any major penalty if any misconduct is established against him in cause of domestic enquiry. It is seen that knowing fully well of this fact the Disciplinary authority exceeding their limit dismissed the concerned workman from his service though opportunity was given to him to submit his reply complying with the provision of clause 27(2) of the Certified Standing Order. This is I should say gross illegality committed by the Disciplinary authority against the concerned workman.

It is the contention of the concerned workman that during the period in question he was lying ill and remained under treatment of the local doctor and in support of his claim he submitted necessary medical certificate. The enquiry officer after completing the enquiry made an observation about ailment of the concerned workman and reliance of medical certificate in support of his claim. The enquiry officer nowhere in his report made any observation to the effect that Medical certificate which the concerned workman submitted was manufactured one and for which he did not get scope to rely on the same. The enquiry officer did not make any whisper why he did not consider the medical certificate submitted by the concerned workman in course of hearing. It is seen that the Disciplinary authority also did not consider this fact. On the contrary the said authority dismissed the concerned workman taking the ground that he was a habitual absentee. It is really curious to note that the Enquiry Officer did not make any whisper in this regard in his report. Accordingly there is sufficient reason to believe that no opportunity was given to the concerned workman to defend himself over that allegation. Considering all aspects it is evident that the concerned workman was actually lying ill during the period in question and in support of his ailment he relied on the medical certificate issued by the Medical Practitioner under whose treatment he remained. Until and unless it is established that the said medical certificate is manufactured one there is no scope to ignore the same. It is fact the concerned workman did not give any prior intimation to the management about his ailment but for that reason he begged apology. It is seen that instead of giving him any opportunity to mend his habit the Disciplinary authority dismissed him from his service though no chargesheet was issued complying with the provision as laid down under clause 27(2) of the Certified Standing Order. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above I hold that the said order of dismissal issued by the Disciplinary authority was not justified and more so, there is sufficient reason to hold that it was not proportionate to the misconduct committed by the concerned workman. Accordingly, I hold that the said order of dismissal is liable to be set aside. The concerned workman deserves reinstatement in service.

In the result, the following award is rendered :—

“The action of the management of P.B. Area of M/s. BCCL is not justified in dismissing the concerned workman Shri Baban Bhuia w.e.f. 27-11-97.

Consequently, the concerned workman is entitled to be reinstated in his original post but without any back wages. However, he will be entitled the continuity of his service from the date of his dismissal to date of his reinstatement.”

The management of P.B. Area of M/s. BCCL is directed to implement the Award within three months from the date of its publication in the Gazette of India in the light of the observation made above.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3620.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधांतर के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अन न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 69/97) को प्रकटित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/118/96-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3620.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 69/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 13-09-2005.

[No. L-20012/118/96-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Reference No. 69 of 1997

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Block II Area of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. D.K. Verma,
Ld. Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal.

Dated Dhanbad, the 22nd August, 2005.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of

the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/118/96-I.R. (C-1) dated, the 12th June, 1997.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the claim of the Union that S/Shri Om Prakash Sharma, Mahendra Sharma, Indal Singh, Upender Kumar Singh, Rajender Saw, Madan Sharma, Mantu Gope, Kanchan Kumar Sharma, Rama Kant Yadav, Krishna Prasad Singh, Jitender Kumar and Jogender Kumar were engaged by the management of M/s. BCCL through contractors in prohibited categories of jobs is correct? If so, whether the demand for regularisation of their services by management is justified? And if so, to what relief are these persons entitled?”

2. Case of the concerned workmen according to Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows:—

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workmen were engaged by the management since long in different units of Block II Area in stone cutting works to be done by various methods and that in course of their duty they used to make hand holes in stones, they used to make holes in big boulders of stones by blasting method lying in different quarries of Block II Area. They submitted that the work which they used to perform were regular in nature and under prohibited category. They submitted that in spite of placing repeated demands management refused to regularise them in permanent rolls. They submitted that management engaged them to perform such prohibited jobs through contractor violating the provision of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. As the management refused to regularise them in the permanent roll they raised industrial dispute before the ALC(C) Dhanbad for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for adjudication. The concerned workmen/sponsoring union submitted prayer to pass award directing the management to regularise the concerned workmen in the roll of the management.

3. Management on the contrary after filing Written Statement-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the concerned workmen/sponsoring union asserted in their Written Statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workmen. They submitted that no employer employee relationship ever existed between them and the concerned workmen. They further submitted that out of the concerned workmen Shri Kanchan Kumar Sharma is known to the management as contractor who was engaged occasionally time to time during the year 1991, 1992 and 1993 on the surface for drilling small shotholes of 1½" dia. on the boulders lying within the peripheries of the opencast working for breaking the same into pieces by blasting operations. The contract jobs was limited to drilling the shotholes manually by crowbars on the boulders only and for which he paid duly. The estimated cost for drilling shotholes manually by using crowbars was Rs. 9,800 spread in the entire surface and

the job was required to be carried on as and when required basis. They disclosed that the said contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma engaged casual workers time to time and drilled the shotholes on different dates according to requirement and submitted his bill which was duly paid to him by the management. Necessary work orders were issued in his favour after his tender was accepted by letter dt. 14-1-91 and he executed the job as and when required basis and received payment. As the job in question was absolutely casual in nature there was no question of engagement of regular worker on regular basis. They submitted that the Central Government issued Notification No. 2063 dt. 21-6-88 prohibiting engagement of contract workers in the jobs of driving stone drifts and miscellaneous stone cutting underground subject to the proviso that contractor workers can be engaged on such jobs for temporary duration for a continuous period of six months. Thus in case of intermittent nature of work, engagement of contractor workers even on the jobs of stone cutting underground has not been prohibited. So far as stone cutting jobs on the surface is concerned, contractor can be engaged specially for drilling holes, breaking boulders, preparation of stone cheeps for the purpose of use in the road making or for use in making of building etc. They submitted further that there is no provision for regularisation of casual worker for a temporary period on some temporary nature of job. Accordingly even the direct employees of the Company cannot demand for their regularisation unless they are engaged on permanent nature of jobs on regular basis. In view of this situation they submitted that the sponsoring union cannot claim for regularisation of the casual workers of the contractor who were engaged intermittently as and when required for drilling shotholes on the boulders on the surface. They submitted that for carrying hand drilling and shotholes intermittently on the boulders on the surface, 2 to 4 workmen are sufficient and it appears that, the sponsoring union in connivance with the contractor has included a large number of persons who are job seekers for getting them inducted into the employment of the Company. Considering the small expenditure used in the instant case they submitted that it is absurd proposition to claim that 12 persons were engaged as contractor workers for doing such petty jobs, maximum expenditure of which was approved @ Rs. 9, 800 only. Accordingly they submitted that the demand of the sponsoring union is illegal and unjustified and for which they submitted prayer to pass award rejecting the claim of the sponsoring union.

4. Points to be decided

“Whether the claims of the Union that S/Shri Om Prakash Sharma, Mahender Sharma, Indal Singh, Upender Kumar Singh, Rajender Saw, Madan Sharma, Manatu Gope, Kanchan Kumar Sharma, Rama Kant Yadav, Krishna Prasad Singh, Jitender Kumar and Jogender Kumar were engaged by the management of M/s. BCCL through contractors in prohibited categories of jobs is correct? If so, whether the demand for regularisation of their services by management is justified? And if so, to what relief are these persons entitled?”

5. FINDING WITH REASONS

It transpires from the record that the sponsoring union with a view to substantiate their claim examined two witnesses as MW-1 and WW-2 while management with a view to substantiate their claim examined one witness as MW-1.

WW-1 during his evidence disclosed that they started working at Jamunia Colliery as Stone Cutter being the employees of the contractor and in that capacity they worked for more than 1½ years under the said contractor. There after this witness disclosed that they started working as stone cutter directly under the management. In support of this claim WW-1 relied on the work order issued by the management in favour of the contractor which during his evidence was marked as Ext. W-1 and W-1/1. This witness disclosed that though they used to work under the contractor they used to draw their wages from the Pay office of the management monthwise. Even used to note their attendance in the attendance register. This witness further disclosed that the work which they used to perform was continuous in nature but management without assigning any reason stopped them from work in the year 1997. During cross-examination this witness admitted that Kanchan Sharma was the contractor who engaged them to carry on stone cutting work. In spite of claiming so this witness failed to submit any paper to show that they were actually engaged by the contractor, Kanchan Kumar Sharma. This witness further admitted that the said contractor never issued any I.D. Card to them. This witness also during his evidence admitted that they do not have any paper to show that management engaged them to work as stone cutter in the said colliery. He also has failed to produce any paper to show that he used to draw his wages from the pay office of the management. Even they have also failed to produce any paper to show that they continuously worked under the management. WW-2 during his evidence disclosed that they started working as stone cutter as workmen of the contractor and under the contractor they worked for about 2 years. However, during his cross-examination he admitted that the said contractor neither issued any letter of appointment nor any I.D. Card to them. MW-1 on the contrary during his evidence disclosed that excepting the work as per work order Ext. W-1 no work was given to the contractor either prior to that date and after to that date. He admitted that during 1991, 1992 and 1993 one Kanchan Kumar Sharma was given contract for performing some job occasionally. This witness categorically denied the fact that the concerned workmen worked under the management continuously. Now considering the evidence of WW-1, WW-2 and MW-1 there is no dispute to hold that the concerned workmen initially started working under contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma as per work order issued by the management. During hearing the sponsoring union relied on the said work order which was issued in favour of said contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma by the management. During evidence of WW-1 the said work order was marked as Ext. W-1 and W-1/1. As per order of reference Kanchan Sharma has been disclosed as a worker though it is admitted fact that he was engaged by the management as contractor. The sponsoring

union accordingly cannot avoid their responsibility to explain how a contractor under whose favour work order was issued by the management to take up certain works, was converted as a workman. In course of hearing the sponsoring union has failed to give any satisfactory explanation to that effect. As per work order marked as Ext. W-1 it transpires that work order was issued in favour of Kanchan Kumar Sharma to take up the work of hand hole. The work order was valued @ Rs. 9800 only and the said work order was issued for making 400 holes with size of 4 feet long 1" dia @ Rs. 24.50 for each hole. Another work order was issued (Ext. W-1/1) in the month of April, 1990 for taking up work at hand hole of size 4' long 1" dia @ Rs. 25 per hole. Therefore, considering these two work orders it is clear that contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma was engaged to carry on the job of hand holes in the area under the management. It is seen from the evidence of WW-1 and WW-2 that under contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma they worked for performing the said job. Therefore, the status of Kanchan Kumar Sharma was nothing but the status of contractor. In spite of knowing fully well about the status of Kanchan Kumar Sharma the sponsoring union without assigning any reason or explanation included his name as worker and raised industrial dispute. Considering evidence of MW-1 and also considering submission of the representative of the management it is clear that excepting the work in the work order as mentioned above no other work was given to the said contractor to perform. Accordingly there is sufficient reason to believe that the job which was assigned to the said contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma was temporary in nature and this will get its support from the letter marked as Ext. W-1. It is the contention of the management that intermittently the said contractor was allowed to make holes on the surface of the boulders for blasting purpose etc. and the number of holes to be dug were 400. Therefore, in no circumstances there is scope to say that the nature of job for which work order issued was permanent in nature.

It is the claim of WW-1 and WW-2 that they worked under Kanchan Kumar Sharma—contractor. The sponsoring union in course of hearing did not consider necessary to examine the said contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma to establish the fact that the concerned workmen were actually engaged by him. In course of hearing the sponsoring union has failed to produce a single scrap of paper to show that either the concerned workmen received the wages from the contractor or from the management. They have failed to produce a single piece of paper to show that they worked under the contractor Kanchan Kumar Sharma first and thereafter they started to work under the management. Burden of proof absolutely rests on the sponsoring union to establish that the management exploited the concerned workmen to take prohibited category of jobs as per the proviso of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. In course of hearing the management relied on the notification No. SO 2063 dt. 21-6-88 issued by the Central Govt. prohibiting engagement of contractor workers in the job of driving stone drifts and misc. stone cutting underground subject to the proviso that contractor workers can be engaged on such job for temporary duration for continuous period of 6 months. They

submitted that work order which was issued by the management will expose clearly that the stone cutting job assigned to the contractor was absolutely intermittent in nature and for which engagement of such contractor to carry on such job never come within the prohibited category as per notification issued by the Central Govt. As per said notification it is therefore clear that any intermittent work duration of which does not exceed 6 months management is at liberty to engage contractor to carry on stone cutting work etc. Onus is on the sponsoring union to establish that violating the said circular management engaged the contractor to carry on stone cutting work which was permanent in nature and duration of which exceeded more than 6 months. Digging of 400 holes on the surface of the boulder if carried on by 12 workers will never last for more than 6 months in any circumstance. Therefore, there is no scope say that management engaged that contractor to carry on prohibited category of jobs duration of which exceeded more than 6 months. In the circumstances I do not find any scope to ignore the submission of the management particularly when inspite of getting ample opportunity the sponsoring union have failed to establish such claim. It is the contention of the management that as there was no employer employee relation existed between them and the concerned workmen question of their regularisation never arose. This submission of the management finds support if the evidence of WW-1 and WW-2 are taken into consideration. These two witnesses categorically submitted that they were workers of the contractor and not of the management. If so, there is no scope to draw any conclusion that employer and employee relationship ever grew up in between them and the management. Accordingly they are to substantiate their claim that they were the worker's of the contractor and management cannot avoid their responsibility to regularise them in service. This fact also the sponsoring union lamentably have failed to establish.

In view of my discussion above I find no hesitation to say that the sponsoring union though got sufficient opportunity to establish their claim lamentably have failed to prove so. In the circumstances, I consider that as the concerned workmen alleged to have been the workmen of the contractor management do not have any responsibility to regularise them in their permanent roll. Accordingly the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief.

In the result, the following award is rendered :—

"The claim of the union that S/Shri Om Prakash Sharma, Mahender Sharma, Indal Singh, Upender Kumar Singh, Rajender Saw, Madan Sharma, Mantu Gope, Kanchan Kumar Sharma, Ram Kant Yadav, Krishna Prasad Singh, Jitender Kumar and Jogender Kumar were engaged by the management of M/s. BCCL through contractors in prohibited categories of jobs is not correct. Therefore, the demand for regularisation of their services by the management is not justified and for which they are not entitled to get any relief."

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

कां.आ. 3621.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 2/2004 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 55/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/85/96-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3621.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Comp No. 2/2004 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 55/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/85/96-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT : Shri B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Ref. No. 55 of 1997—Ministry's order No. L-20012/85/96-IR (C-I), dt. 1-5-97)

COMPLAINT PETITION NO. 2 OF 2004

PARTIES :

Rajesh Chauhan, S/o. Sri Ramashis Chauhan
of Barora Colliery, P.O. Nawagarh
Distt. Dhanbad

....Complainant

Versus

The Project Officer,
Barora Coal Washery,
M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd.,
P.O. Nawagarh, Distt. Dhanbad.

....Opp. Party

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad the 19th August, 2005.

AWARD

This is a Complaint petition under Section 33A of the I.D. Act., 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management mentioned above.

In this case neither the complainant nor his representative was found present on the date fixed. O.P. management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires from the record that the instant case is pending since 2004. It also further transpires from the record that neither the complainant nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal consecutively on the dates fixed. Gesture of the complainant if it is taken into consideration will expose clearly that he is not interested to proceed with the hearing of the complaint case. In the circumstances, there is no reason to drag on the case suo moto. Hence, the complaint case is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3622.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 123/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/223/97-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3622.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 123/98) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II. now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/223/97-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
DHANBAD**

PRESENT : Shri B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

Ref. No. 123 of 1998**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the management of Lodna Area of
M/s. BCCL and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : Mr. B.B. Pandey, Ld.
Advocate

On behalf of the management : Mr. D.K. Verma, Ld
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal.

New Delhi, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/223/97-I.R. (C-I) dated the 30th April, 1998.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Lodna Colliery of M/s. BCCL in dismissing of Sh. Ram Sakal Mali, Tremmer w.e.f. 4-11-95 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workman according to written statement submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows :

They submitted that the concerned workman was a Trammer at Lodna Colliery under Lodna Area. They submitted that management issued charge sheet to the concerned workman bearing no. L-223/93 dtd. 19/21-10-93. Concerned workman submitted his explanation denying the charges brought against him. They submitted that in spite of giving reply management without accepting the same initiated departmental enquiry against him. They alleged that the enquiry officer conducted the said departmental enquiry not fairly, properly and in accordance with the principle of natural justice. Even he was not given sufficient opportunity to defend his case. They alleged that on the basis of the report of the Departmental enquiry as punishment management put him on 'Badli List'

They submitted that thereafter management issued him another charge sheet bearing no. L/254/94 dtd. 18/19-10-94 to the concerned workman without ulterior motive. He after receipt of the said charge sheet submitted his reply denying the charges brought against him but the management without accepting his reply initiated Departmental enquiry against him. They submitted that thereafter relying on the reports submitted by the Enquiry Officer Disciplinary Authority dismissed him from service illegally, arbitrarily and violating the principle of natural justice. Accordingly, the concerned workman through sponsoring union raised an Industrial Dispute for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The sponsoring union accordingly submitted prayer to pass award directing the management to reinstate the concerned workman in service from the date of dismissal i.e. 4-11-95 along with back wages and other consequential relief setting aside the said order of dismissal.

3. Management on the contrary after filing Written statement-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the written statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workman.

They submitted that the concerned workman was issued charge sheet for his unauthorised absence vide letter No. 22393 dtd. 19-10-93 and a Departmental Enquiry was initiated against him. As the charge levelled against

him was found established he was put under 'Badli List' and allowed to join his duty.

Subsequently on the basis of complaint received from the Vigilance Department against the concerned workman to the effect that he produced fake medical documents at the time of his first enquiry in support of his unauthorised absence a fresh charge sheet was issued to him vide No. L-254/94 dt. 18/19-10-94.

They submitted that concerned workman though submitted his reply was not satisfactory and for which another domestic enquiry was initiated against him. They disclosed that at the time of the said enquiry full opportunity was given to him to defend his case and allowed him to cross examine the witnesses produced by the management. After completion of enquiry the said enquiry officer submitted his report holding the concerned guilty to the charges brought against him.

Accordingly, Disciplinary Authority after considering the report of the Enquiry Officer and also considering all other aspects dismissed the concerned workman from service. They submitted that management did not commit any illegality in dismissing the concerned workman from service and for which he is not entitled to get any relief.

4. Points to be Decided

"Whether the action of the management of Lodna Colliery of M/s BCCL in dismissing of Sh. Ram Sakal Mali, Tremmer w.e.f. 4-11-95 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

5. Finding With Reasons

It transpires from the record that before taking up hearing of this case on merit it was taken up into consideration if domestic enquiry held against the concerned workman by the Enquiry Officer was fair, proper and in accordance with the principle of natural justice. The said issue on preliminary point was disposed of in view of order No. 19 dt. 3-11-04 in favour of the management.

Now, the point for consideration is if the management have been able to substantiate the charge brought against the concerned workman and if so, whether there is any scope to review the order of dismissal issued by the management against the concerned workman u/s II-A of the Industrial Dispute Act.

There is no dispute to hold that for committing misconduct on the allegation of absentism management issued a charge sheet to the concerned workman vide No. L/273/93 dt. 19/21-10-93 under clause 26 : 1 : 1 of the Certified Standing order (Exht. M-7/11). Concerned workman after receipt of the said charge sheet submitted his reply but as the reply submitted by him was not satisfactory the Disciplinary Authority initiated domestic enquiry against him. At the time of hearing of the said enquiry proceeding the concerned workman in support of his claim produced some medical papers the copies of which during evidence of M.W. I. were marked as Exht. M-7/3 series. It is admitted fact that previous enquiry officer though considered those medical papers did not accept

the ground of his absence and for which he submitted his report holding him guilty to the charge brought against him. Thereafter the matter was placed before Disciplinary Authority and the said Disciplinary Authority considering the report of the enquiry papers as well as all their papers including medical papers submitted by him at the time of hearing of the enquiry proceeding decided to impose punishment and accordingly placed him on 'Badli List' eliminating him from his permanent post of Trammer.

It is the contention of the management that subsequently on receipt of a complaint from the Vigilance Department to the effect that the concerned workman in course of first enquiry produced fake medical documents a fresh charge sheet was issued to him bearing No. L/254/94 dt. 18/19-10-94 for committing misconduct for violation of clause 26 : 1 : 1, 26 : 1 : 12, and 26 : 1 : 20 of the Certified Standing order. After receipt of the said charge sheet he submitted his reply. During evidence of M.W.I. the charge sheet and reply given by the concerned workman were marked as Exht. M-2 & M-3 respectively. In the instant case the concerned workman also defended his case but the enquiry officer after completing enquiry submitted his report holding him guilty to the charges and accordingly the Disciplinary Authority considering his report dismissed him from his service. The enquiry report and the order of dismissal during evidence of M.W.I. were marked as Exht. M-5 and M-6 respectively.

It is seen that management issued three fold charge sheet against the concerned workman. The first charge under clause 26 : 1 : 1 of the Certified Standing order brought against him was decided by the first Enquiry Officer when specific charge on that ground was brought against him. It is the cardinal principle of law that a person can not be punished twice on the same cause of action. It is evident that management ignoring the said principle of law with vindictive attitude issued charge sheet again on the same offence i.e. under clause 26 : 1 : 1 of the Certified Standing Order for his further enquiry Over Commitment of the self same misconduct when relying on the report of the 1st Enquiry Officer. Disciplinary Authority imposed punishment on him it should be considered absolutely illegal to open further enquiry by issuing fresh charge sheet on the self same grant. Therefore, decision made on this point of charge is to be considered as absolutely illegal and arbitrary and for which it is liable to be quashed.

Apart from framing of charge under clause 26 : 1 : 1 management have brought two separate charges against him under clause 26 : 1 : 12 and 26 : 1 : 20 of the Certified Standing order on the allegation of giving false information to the management when first charge sheet under clause 26 : 1 : 1 was issued against him dt. 19/20-10-93 Exht. M-7/11.

The allegation of the management is that after imposing punishment upon the concerned workman by the Disciplinary Authority relying on the report of the Enquiry Officer they received a complaint from the Vigilance Department to the effect that he produced fake medical papers before the first Enquiry Officer in support of his plea of innocence.

It is the contention of the management that after receipt of the said complaint the Disciplinary Authority issued second charge sheet to him and initiated further domestic enquiry against him. Therefore, if the principle of the law of evidence is taken into consideration the burden of proof as to any particular fact lies on that person who wishes the Court to believe in its existence, unless it is provided by any law that the proof of that fact shall lie on any particular person.

It is admitted fact that during first enquiry the concerned workman relied on some medical papers to establish the reason of his absence for which he received charge sheet from the Disciplinary Authority. During hearing of the first enquiry proceeding the Enquiry Officer considered those medical papers but did not accept the same to accept the reason of absence of the concerned workman. No. evidence on the part of the management is forthcoming to the effect that the said first enquiry officer made any observation in his finding that all those medical papers produced by him were fake. Even there is no evidence to the effect that Disciplinary Authority before imposing punishment made any observation to the effect that the concerned workman in support of his claim relied on medical papers which were fake. On the contrary relying on the report of the first enquiry officer the Disciplinary Authority as punishment issued order of demotion against him. Though that chapter of domestic enquiry was closed after passing order of punishment the same was reopened by issuing second charge sheet to him by the Disciplinary on the allegation of committing misconduct already referred to above. The second charge sheet was issued on the basis of a complaint received from the Vigilance Deptt. that the concerned workman in support of his plea of innocence produced fake medical papers. Therefore, the complain which the Vigilance Department submitted before the management should be consider as vital document to consider how they arrived into the conclusion about submission of fake medical papers. M. W.I. who was entrusted to enquire the matter in view of charge sheet issued to the concerned workman during his evidence categorically admitted that management did not produce that complain before him for consideration. The management also did not produce any officer of the Vigilant Deptt. as witness not only to prove the complaint but also to identify the medical papers which they alleged as fake medical papers. The management also did not examine any Doctor to establish the allegation that the medical papers which were issued using his name were not at all issued by him. Burden of proof absolutely rests on the management to establish that the medical papers which the concerned workman relied on are absolutely fake document and he submitted the same to influence the management for his personal gain damaging the interest of the management. It is seen that the enquiry officer without considering all these vital aspects shirked responsibility upon the concerned workman to establish that the medical papers as per allegations were not fake. Such observation of the Enquiry Officer was not only contrary to the principle of law but also it exposed his biasness and inclination towards management. It is really shocking to note that in course

of final hearing of this case the Enquiry Officer i.e. M.W.I. failed to identify which medical papers according to the allegation of the Vigilance Deptt. were fake.

In course of hearing Ld. Advocate for the management relying on the decision reported in 2004 LAB I.C. 3744 submitted that management was justified in dismissing the concerned workman from service as he relied on fake medical papers in support of his claim. Their Lordship of the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 9 & 10 observed as follows :

"This Court in the case of *State of Haryana & Anr. v. Ratan Singh* (1977) 2 SCC 491 which is also a case arising out of non issuance of ticket by 2 conductor held thus :

In a domestic enquiry all the strict and sophisticated rules of Evidence Act may not apply. all materials which are logically relevant for a prudent mind are permissible, though departmental authorities and Administrative Tribunal must be careful in evaluating such material and should not glibly swallow what is strictly speaking not relevant under the Evidence Act. The essence of judicial approach is objectivity, exclusion of extraneous materials or considerations, and observance of rules of natural justice. Fair play is the basis and if perversity or arbitrariness, bias or surrender of independence of judgement, vitiate the conclusion reached such a finding, even of a domestic Tribunal cannot be held to be good. The simple point in all these cases is, was there some evidence or was there no evidence—not in the sense of the technical rules governing Court proceedings but in fair commonsense way as men of understanding and wordly wisdom will accept. Sufficiency of evidence in proof of the finding by a domestic Tribunal is beyond scrutiny by Court, while absence of any evidence in support of the finding is an error of law apparent on the record and the Court can interfere with the finding.

"From the above it is clear once a domestic Tribunal based on evidence comes to a particular conclusion normally it is not open to the Appellate Tribunals and Courts to substitute their subjective opinion in the place of the one arrived at by the domestic Tribunal. In the present case, there is evidence of the Inspector who checked the bus which establishes the misconduct of the respondent. The domestic Tribunal accepted that evidence and found the respondent. The domestic Tribunal accepted that evidence and found the respondent faulty. But the Courts below misdirected themselves in insisting on the evidence of the ticketless passengers to reject the said finding which, in our opinion, as held by this Court in the case of *Ratan Singh* (supra) has not been followed by this Court in *Devendra Swamy V. Karnataka State Road Transport Corporation* [(2000) 9 SCC 644]".

Considering the observation of the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 10 it is clear that there was evidence of the Inspector who checked the bus which establishes the misconduct of the respondent. Here in the instant case neither management examined the officer of the Vigilance Department nor marked the Medical papers which were fake. To prove the fake medical papers they also did not consider necessary even to examine the Doctor alleged to

have issued the same. Management cannot exonerate their responsibility to establish the charge brought against him particularly when relying on the report of the Enquiry Officer he was dismissed from his service. It is seen that in first occasion management issued order of demotion for committing misconduct by the concerned workman disbelieving the medical papers which he relied on and on the second occasion with the allegation of producing fake medical papers he was dismissed from his service. The charges under clause 26 : 1 : 12 and clause 26 : 1 : 20 ought to have been brought against him while first enquiry was proceeded on. There is no evidence that first enquiry officer and the Disciplinary Authority who imposed punishment of demotion made any observation to the effect that the medical papers which the concerned workman relied on were fake. It is seen that the concerned workman had to face two punishment, consentively though I find no hesitation to say that management in course of hearing this case on merit have failed to establish the charge brought against him. Accordingly, order of dismissal issued by the management relying on the charges which they have failed to establish is liable to be set aside.

Considering the provision as laid down U/s 11-A of the Industrial Dispute Act I therefore hold that as the order of dismissal was not justified in view of the observation made above. I hold that concerned workman deserves his reinstatement in service setting aside the order of dismissal.

In the result the following award is rendered :

That the action of the management of Lodna Colliery of M/s BCCL in dismissing of Sri Ram Sakal Mali, Trummer w.e.f. 4-11-95 was not justified.

Management is directed to reinstate the concerned workman named above to his service with effect from 4-11-95 within three months from the date of publication of the award in the Gazette of India. He will be entitled to get 25% of the back wages from the date of dismissal till the date of his joining to his post.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3623.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 37/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/473/99-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3623.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 37/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure

in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/473/99-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

Ref. No. 37 of 2000

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Lodna Colliery of M/s BCCL and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : Mr. K. Chakravorty, Ld.,
Advocate

On behalf of the management : Mr. D. K. Verma, Ld.
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

New Delhi, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/473/99-I.R. (C-I) dated the 18th February, 2000.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Lodna Colliery of M/s. BCCL in dismissing Sh. Ram Bhajan Bauri from the services of the company w.e.f. 26-5-97 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled."

2. The case of the concerned workman according to written statement submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows :

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workman was a minor loader at Lodna Colliery. They submitted that as the concerned was suffering from T.B. he remained under treatment of Company's Doctor for a long period and the management was very much aware of this fact.

They alleged that inspite of getting knowlege about ailment of the concerned workman the Disciplinary Authority issued chrgsheet to him dated 1-1-99 with the allegation of committing misconduct on the ground of absentism. They submitted that after receipt of the said chargesheet he submitted the reply stating the facts of his treatment as T.B. Patient but instead of accepting the said reply they initiated domestic enquiry against him. The enquiry officer they alleged after making a perverse enquiry submitted report holding the concerned workman guilty to the charge and the Disciplinary Authority relying on the said perverse report dismissed him from service illegally arbitrarily and violating the principle of the natural justice.

After the said order of dismissal they submitted representation to the management with prayer to reinstate the concerned workman to his service recalling the said order of dismissal but that prayer yielded no result and for which they reaised an Industrial Dispute before ALC (C) for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The Sponsoring union on behalf of the concerned workman accodingly submitted prayer to pass award directing the management to reinstate the concerned workman to his service recalling the said order of dismissal with full backwages and other consequential relieve.

3. Management on the contrary after filing written statement-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the written statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workman.

They submitted that the concerned workman started remaining himself absent from duty w.e.f. 28-2-95 without giving any intimation or taking any permission from the appropriate authority and for which a chargesheet was issued to him dated 1-1-97. After receipt of the said chargesheet concerned workman submitted his reply assigning the reason of his absence but as the same was not satisfactory the Disciplinary Authority initiated domestic enquiry against him. They submitted that in course of hearing of the said enquiry proceeding the concerned workman not only remained present but also full opportunity was given to him to defend his case. They further submitted that the said enquiry officer conducted that domestic enquiry fairly properly and in accordance with the principle of natural justice and after completion of hearing of the said enquiry proceeding submitted his report holding the concerned workman guilty to the charges brought against him. They submitted that after submission of the report the Disciplinary Authority supplied the enquiry report to the concerned workman with a view to give him an opportunity to submit his explanation. Thereafter, the Disciplinary Authority dismissed him from service w.e.f. 26-5-97. They disclosed that the said order of dismissal

was legal and justified and for which the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief.

4. POINT TO BE DECIDED.—

“ Whether the action of the management of Lodna Colliery of M/s. BCCL in dismissing Sri Ram Bhajan Bauri from the services of the Company w.e.f. 26-5-97 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ? ”

5. FINDING WITH REASONS.—

It transpires from the record that before hearing this case on merit it was taken into consideration as preliminary issue whether domestic enquiry held against the concerned workman was fair, proper and in accordance with the principle of natural justice. The said issue on preliminary point was disposed of vide order No. 12 dated 4-4-05 in favour of the management.

Now on merit the point for consideration is if the management have been able to substantiate the charge brought against the concerned workman and if so whether there is any scope to review the said order of dismissal issued against him U/s. 11-A of the Industrial Dispute Act.

It is admitted fact that the concerned workman was a miner loader at Lodna Colliery. The allegation of the management is that the concerned workman without giving any intimation or without taking any permission from the appropriate authority started remaining himself absent from duty w.e.f. 28-2-95. As such unauthorised absence amounted to misconduct as per clause 26 : 1 : 1 of the Certified Standing order the Disciplinary Authority issued a charge sheet dated 1-2-97. The charge sheet during evidence of M.W.I was marked as Ext. M-2.

Contention of the sponsoring union is that the concerned workman was a T.B. Patient and for which he remained under treatment of the Company's hospital for a long period. Their further contention is that knowing fully well of this fact management illegally and arbitrarily issued chargesheet to him. They further submitted that after receipt of the said chargesheet the concerned workman submitted his reply wherein he disclosed the reason of his absent from duty. They alleged that inspite of the said reply Disciplinary Authority without accepting the same initiated domestic enquiry against him. Reply given by the concerned workman during hearing was marked in Exht. M-3.

From his said reply it transpires that as he was not provided with Company's quarter he had to attend his place of work from his native village. He further disclosed that on 28-2-95 he fell ill and as there was no male member in his family he could not give any information about the reason of his absence to the management. He made the same nature of statement before the enquiry officer at the time of domestic enquiry which was duly recorded. It transpires from his cross-examination made by the representative of the management that as per medical certificate produced by him he was under medical treatment from 1-9-95. to 14-10-96. Therefore, it is clear that the

concerned workman for his ailment started his treatment from 1-9-95. It is the contention of the sponsoring union that the concerned workman was a T.B. Patient and for which he remained under treatment of the colliery hospital for a long period. In spite of claiming so the sponsoring union is silent actually from which period he was diagnosed as a T. B. Patient and remained under treatment at a colliery hospital. In spite of getting ample opportunity neither the sponsoring union nor the concerned workman considered necessary to produce a single medical paper to substantiate the claim in question.

Therefore, considering the medical certificate which the concerned workman produced before the enquiry officer it should be taken into consideration that he was under treatment of the Doctor from 1-9-95 to 14-10-96. The concerned workman started remaining himself absent from duty without giving any intimation or taking prior permission from the authority w.e.f. 28-2-95. As per medical certificate the concerned workman was declared medical fit on 14-10-96. The charge sheet in the instant case was issued to him on 1-1-97. If it is taken into consideration that he was lying ill from 1-9-95 to 14-10-95 he cannot exonerate his liability to explain what was the reason of his remaining unauthorised absent from 28-2-95 to 31-8-95 and from 15-10-96 to 30-6-97. In the reply to the charge explanation for his absence which he gave is far from satisfactory. Even explanation given by him while he made statement to the enquiry officer also finds no cogent reason to accept. Considering the facts & circumstances discussed above there is sufficient reason to hold that management was justified in issuing chargesheet to him under clause 26 : 1 : 1 of the Certified Standing Order and in course of hearing they have substantiated the charge brought against him.

Now the point for consideration is if there is any scope to review the order of punishment imposed upon the concerned workman U/s 11-A of the Industrial Dispute Act. Section 11-A of the Industrial Dispute Act speaks as follows :

“Where an industrial dispute relating to the discharge or dismissal of a workman has been referred to a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal for adjudication and, in the course of the adjudication proceedings, the Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal as the case may be, is satisfied that the order of discharge or dismissal was not justified, it may be its award, set aside the order of discharge or dismissal and direct reinstatement of the workman on such terms and conditions if any, as it thinks fit, or give such other relief to the workman including the award of any lesser punishment in lieu of discharge or dismissal as the circumstances of the case may be require.”

Therefore, according to this provision of law it is to be looked into if the order of dismissal issued against the concerned workman by the management was justified and proportionate to the misconduct committed by him. In course of hearing the order of dismissal issued by the

management was marked as Exht. M-8. From the order it transpires that previous to issuance of charge sheet in connection with their case on the allegation of committing similar misconduct another chargesheet was issued to the concerned workman in the year 1994-95. It transpires that instead of imposing any substantive punishment management released him on giving due warning. It transpires that immediately thereafter the concerned workman again started absenting from duty w.e.f. 25-2-95 without giving any intimation or taking any permission from the management. As a result management again issued charge sheet dated 1/8-1-97 to him. Therefore, it speaks clearly that the management was compelled to take further steps against him as he remained absent unauthorisedly for about two years continuously. No doubt the concerned workman in his reply to the charge sheet as well as at the time of giving his statement before the enquiry officer took the plea that owing to his illness being a T. B. Patient he was not in a position to attend his duty. Therefore, burden shifted on him to substantiate his claim. In view of my discussion above it has well been established that excepting for a limited period he has failed to account for his absence from 25-2-95 to 1-1-97. He has also failed to produce any cogent document to show that he intimated the management in due course of time about the reason of his absence. Considering these aspects there are sufficient reasons to arrive into conclusion that the concerned workman was not at all duly bound to abide by the discipline to be maintained in the place of his work. His attitude has exposed clearly that he was absolutely whimsical and careless in attending his place of work to perform his duties. It has been exposed clearly that for committing similar misconduct in spite of imposing any punishment due opportunity was given to him by the management with a view to mend his conduct but ignoring that opportunity given to him he again committed the same misconduct and remained himself absent from duty continuously for about two years without giving any intimation or taking prior permission of the management.

Therefore, considering all aspects carefully there is sufficient reasons to hold that the concerned workman misused the privilege given to him by the management without taking minimum venture to mend his conduct. Accordingly, in view of the facts and circumstances discussed about I hold that the order of dismissal issued by the management against him was justified and proportionate to the misconduct committed by him and for which I do not find any cogent reason to review his order of dismissal from service relying on the provision as laid down u/s 11-A of the I.D. Act. In the result the following award is rendered:

“That the action of the management of Iodna Colliery of M/s BCCL in dismissing Sri Rambhajan Bauri from the services of the Company w.e.f. 26-5-97 is justified and for which he is not entitled to get any relief.”

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

AWARD

का. आ. 3624.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा०को०को०लि० के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 4/2001 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 119/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/525/2000-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3624.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 4/2001 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 119/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/525/2000-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) AT
DHANBAD**

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the
I.D. Act, 1947

(Arising out of Ref. No. 119 of 2001—Ministry's
Order No. L-20012/525/2000-C-I dt. 29-3-2001)

Complaint Petition No. 4 of 2001

PERTIES:

Chhota Chandar Paswan,
Kujama Colliery,
P. O. Lodna, Distt. DhanbadComplainant

Versus

Project Officer/Manager,
Kujama Colliery of M/s. BCCL,
P. O. Lodna, Distt. DhanbadO.P.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the complainant : Mr. S.C. Gaur,
Advocate.

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management mentioned above.

In this case both the parties appeared through their authorised representative. The case then proceeded along its course. However, in course of hearing Ld. Advocate for the complainant submitted that as the Award in Reference case has already been passed the complainant is not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. No objection raised on the side of the O.P. management in view of the prayer made by the Ld. Advocate for the complainant. In view of the facts and circumstances the instant complaint case is dismissed.

B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3625.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा०को०को०लि० के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 7/2003 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 174/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/356/98-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3625.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 7/2003 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 174/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/356/98-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) AT
DHANBAD**

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the
I.D. Act, 1947

Complaint Petition No. 7 of 2003

PERTIES:

Mani Deshwali,
Timber Helper and two other,
Stowring Mazdoor,
Patherdih Colliery,
E.J. Area of M/s. BCC Ltd.Complainants

Versus

Management of Patherdih Colliery of
M/s. BCCL, P.O. Patherdih Colliery,
Dist. DhanbadOpp. Party

(Arising out of Ref. No. 174/99—Ministry's Order No.
L-20012/356/98-IR (C-I), dated 5-4-99)

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Complainants : None

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
Management Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainants against the O.P. management mentioned named above.

In this case neither the complainants nor their representative appeared before this Tribunal in the matter of taking further steps in this case. The O.P. management however, made appearance through their authorised representative. Since the complainants failed to take further step in the matter of hearing of the instant Complaint case their is no reason to drag on the same. In the result, the Complaint petition is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3626.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा०को०को०लि० के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 5/2001 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 299/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/304/2001-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3626.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 5/2001 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 299/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/304/2001-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) AT
DHANBAD**

PRESENT :

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the
I.D. Act, 1947

(Arising out of Ref. No. 299 of 2001—Ministry's
Order No. L-20012/2/304/2001 IR (C-I),
dated, the 23rd Nov. 2001)

Complaint No. 5 of 2002

PARTIES :

Shri Lal Babu Singh and two others,
PRMS/Loader of Patherdih Colliery of
M/s. BCC Ltd.Complainants

Versus

The Employers in relation to the
Management of Patherdih Colliery of
M/s. BCC Ltd., P.O. Patherdih,
Dist. Dhanbad.Opp. Party

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Complainants : None

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
Ld. Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a complaint petition under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management named above.

2. The case of the Complainants is that they were originally employed at Patherdih Colliery of M/s. BCCL as piece rated Miner/Loader under piece rated Group V-A. The O.P. management of Patherdih Colliery after changing the job of the complainants diverted them to piece rated Trammer in Group-V from P.R.M./Loader with effect from 13-7-99. They disclosed that after completion of one year continuous service in the permanent vacant posts of Trammer, the complainants became fully eligible and qualified themselves for being regularised as Trammer w.e.f. 15-7-2000 in terms of the provisions of the Company's Certified Standing Orders. As O.P. management refused to regularise them in the post of Trammer they raised an industrial dispute with prayer for their regularisation as Trammer w.e.f. 15-7-2000. They disclosed that during pendency of the Conciliation proceeding the Complainants were allowed by the O.P. management to continue to work on the job of Trammer at Patherdih Colliery, but during pendency of Industrial dispute before the Ministry of Labour, Government of India the management resorted to

change the service condition prevailing during the pendency of the Industrial Dispute and forcibly deployed them as piece rated Miner/Loader w.e.f. 9-8-2001. They alleged that such decision of changing the service condition prevailing during the pendency of the Industrial Dispute has been taken by the management without any permission from competent authority under the I.D. Act, 1947 in contravention of Section 33 of the said Act. They alleged that the O.P. management illegally and arbitrarily changed the service condition violating the principle of natural justice.

3. O.P. management on the contrary after filing the Written Objection submitted that the complainants were originally appointed as Miner/Loader under female VRS excepting Ram Pada Orang who was appointed in lieu of death of his father on different dates from 1-1-96 to 10-5-97 and 9-11-95. As per rules of the management, they disclosed that Miner/Loader in general and who are appointed under VRS cannot be diverted to any other category which is strictly prohibited. As per guidelines of the O.P. management the vacancy of piece rated Trammers can be filled up by piece rate Miner/Loaders who have completed 20 years of service as Miner/Loader and must be 50 years of age. As none of the complainants have put 20 years of service as Miner/Loader and as none of them are aged 50 years and above, they are not entitled to claim the post of Trammer and therefore, they are not eligible to claim for their regularisation. They submitted that the complainants might have worked as Trammer as and when required in the leave/Sick vacancies and they did not put on regular and continuous attendance required for regularisation.

FINDING WITH REASONS

4. It is seen that the complainants in support of their claim did not consider necessary to adduce any evidence to the effect that during pendency of the industrial dispute their service conditions were changed by the management illegally and arbitrarily violating Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The O.P. management categorically denied the claim of the complainants. As the reference case is very much sub-judice here for decision, in the Complaint case there is no scope to draw any conclusion that an order was issued in favour of the complainants to work as Trammer. Question of change of service condition as per this Section only can be taken up for consideration if it is established that the complainants were actually engaged for the post of Trammer by order of the O.P. management. Therefore, until and unless this aspect is established clearly by the complainants there is no scope to arrive into conclusion that O.P. management illegally and arbitrarily changed their service condition. Considering the nature of the dispute as raised by the Complainants I emphatically say that it has to be decided first in disposing of the original Reference case if the complainants were actually appointed by the O.P. management as Trammer. As no material is forthcoming in that regard at this stage I do not find any scope to consider prayer of the Complainant that O.P. management illegally and arbitrarily changed their service condition.

In the result, the Complainant petition filed by complainants stands dismissed.

B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. अ. 3627.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भ०खे०को०लि० के प्रबंधांतर के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/त्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 1/1996 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 98/95) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/81/94-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3627.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 1/96 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 98/95) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/81/94-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33 A of the I.D. Act, 1947

(Arising out of Ref. No. 98 of 1995—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/81/94-IR (C-I) dt. 17-7-1995)

Complaint Petition No. 1 of 1996

PARTIES:

Shri Mukteshwar Singh Complainant
Chaudhury

Versus

Management of Moonidih Coal Opp. Party
Washery Area of M/s. BCCL

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the complainant : None

On behalf of the O.P. : None

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management mentioned above.

In this case neither the complainant nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal after filing the instant complaint petition. None also appeared on behalf of the O.P. management. It transpires from the record that inspite of giving sufficient opportunities both the parties failed to appear before this Tribunal for taking necessary steps in this case. Therefore, there is reason to believe that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under the circumstances, the complaint petition is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3628.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सी एम पी डी आई एल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 1/91 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 100/91) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/197/90-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3628.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 1/91 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 100/91) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of CMPDIL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/197/90-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
DHANBAD**

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947

[Arising out of Ref. No. 100 of 1991—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/197/90-IR (C-I) dt. 12-2-1991]

Complaint No. 1 of 1991**PARTIES:**

Shri Ajay Mallick, Sweeper,Complainants
Staff Training College.
C.M.P.D.I. Ltd., Gondwana Place,
Kanke Road, Ranchi and 5 others.

Versus

Employers in relation to theOpp. Party
Management of Central Mine
Planning & Design Institute Ltd.,
Gondwana Place, Kanke Road,
Ranch and 5 others.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the complainants : None

On behalf of the O.Ps. : Mr. B.P. Singh,
P.M. (SE)

State : Jharkhand Industry : Mine Planning

Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainants against the O.P.s mentioned above.

In this case neither the complainants nor the representative appeared before this Tribunal. Management/O.Ps. however made appearance through their authorised representative. This is a case of 1991. Record shows that since long representative of the complainants is not taking any step inspite of issuance of notices. Under the circumstances, this Tribunal also finds no ground to adjourn the case suo moto. In the result, the instant Complaint is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3629.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा. को. को. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 2/2002 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 120/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/526/2000-आई आर (सं.-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3629.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 2/2002 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 120/2001) of the Central

Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/526/2000-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33 A of the I.D. Act, 1947

[Arising out of Ref. No. 120 of 2001—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/526/2000 (C-I) dt. 29-3-2001]

Complaint Petition No. 2 of 2002

PARTIES:

Shri Satrugan Singh and
Shivanand Tiwary,Complainants
Bastacolla Colliery of M/s. BCCL.

Versus

Management of Bastacolla Area
of M/s. BCCL.Opp. Party

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the complainants : None

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33 A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management named above.

In this case neither the complainant nor his representative was found present on the date fixed. O.P. Management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires further from the record that the complainant or his representative failed to appear before this Tribunal consecutively, in the matter of hearing of the instant complaint case. Under the circumstances this Tribunal also finds no ground to adjourn the case suo moto for taking steps by the complainant. In the result, the complaint petition is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3630.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 3/2004 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 281/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/400/2001-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3630.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 3/2004 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 281/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/400/2001-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Present:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947

[Arising out of Ref. No. 281/2001—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/400/2001 IR (C-I) dt. 23rd October, 2001]

Complaint Petition No. 3 of 2004

PARTIES:

Shiv Narayan Chauhan,
S/o Sri Ram Lakhon Chauhan,Complainant
resident of Barora Colliery,
P.O. Nawagarh, Dist. Dhanbad.

Versus

The Project Officer,
Barora Coal Washery,Opp. Party
M/s. BCCL, P.O. Nawagarh,
Dist. Dhanbad.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainant : None
 On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
 Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management named above.

In this case neither the complainant nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. O.P. management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires from the record that the instant Complaint case is pending since 2004. It also further transpires from the record that the Complainant or his representative failed to appear before this Tribunal consecutively on the dates fixed for hearing. Gesture of the complainant if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that he is not interested to proceed with the hearing of the complainant case. In the circumstances, there is no reason to drag on the case suo moto. Hence, the complaint case is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3631.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सी. एम. पी. डी. आई. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 3/91 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 100/91) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/284/90-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3631.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 3/91 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 100/91) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of CMPDIL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/284/90-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
 INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
 DHANBAD**

PRESENT :

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947

(Arising out of Ref. No. 100 of 1991—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/284/90-IR-C.I. dt. 18-12-1990)

Complaint No. 3 of 1991**PARTIES :**

Shri Sunil Kumar Sinha,
 Staff Training College,
 C.M.P.D.I. Ltd., Gondwana Place,
 Kanke Road, Ranchi and 11 Ors.Complainants

Versus

Employers in relation to the
 management of Central Mine
 Planning & Design Institute Ltd.,Opp. Party
 Gondwana Place, Kanke Road,
 Ranchi and 5 others.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the complainants : None

On behalf of the O.Ps. : Mr. R. P. Singh,
 Office Supdt.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Mine Planning

Dated, Dhanbad, the 17th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.Ps. named above.

In this case neither the complainants nor their representative appeared before this Tribunal. O.Ps. however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires from the record that inspite of adjournment of the case on repeated occasion the complainants have failed to turn up with a view to take steps. Considering the attitude of the complainants there is sufficient reason to believe that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. At this stage I do not find any cogent ground to drag on the case only for the expectation of the appearance of the complainants. Hence, the case is closed and dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3632.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि

के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 1/97 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 151/96) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/423/95-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3632.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 1/97 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 151/96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/423/95-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947

(Arising out of Ref. No. 151 of 1996—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/423/95-IR (Coal-I) dtd. 18-12-1996)

Complaint Petition No. 1 of 1997

APPEARANCES:

The Workmen/Union representedComplainant
by National Coal Workers Congress,
Water Board Colony, Hirapur,
Dhanbad.

Versus

General Manager, GovindpurOpp. Party
Area No. III of M/s. BCCL, P.O.
Sonardih, P.S. Sonardih,
Distt. Dhanbad and another.

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dated. Dhanbad, the 17th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.Ps. mentioned above.

In this case neither the complainant nor his representative appeared before the Tribunal. None also appeared on behalf of the O.Ps. As both the sides failed to turn up before the Tribunal inspite of giving sufficient opportunities, there is reason to believe that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of the case. Under the circumstances, this Tribunal also finds no ground to adjourn the case suo moto for days together. Hence, the complaint petition is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3633.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (Comp. No. 1/2002 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 163/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/185/2000-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3633.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp. No. 1/2002 Arisi. out of Ref. No. 163/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/185/2000-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947

[Arising out of Ref. No. 163 of 2000—Ministry's Order No. L-20012/185/2000-(C-I), dtd. 18-10-2000]

Complaint Petition No. 1 of 2002

PARTIES :

Unit Prasad Singh Complainant

Versus

Management of Block-II, Opp. Party
Area of M/s. BCCL, P.O.
Nawagarh, Distt. Dhanbad

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of the complaint : Mr. S.C. Gaur
Advocate

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. D.K. Verma,
Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 17th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management mentioned above.

In this case both the parties appeared through their authorised representative. The case then proceeded along its course. However, in course of hearing Ld. Advocate for the complainant submitted that the instant complaint case has been initiated out of Ref. No. 163/2000. As the complainant has already been superannuated from his service it has become infructuous to proceed with the hearing of the complaint and for which he declined to proceed further in this case. No objection raised on the side of the O.P. management in view of the prayer of the Ld. Advocate for the Complainant. Since the complainant is not willing to proceed with the hearing of this case, there is no reason to adjourn the case *suo moto*. Hence, the Complaint case is dismissed for non-prosecution.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3634.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) को धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 111/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[एल-20012/122/2004-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3634.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 111/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/122/2004-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Industrial Dispute under Section
10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 111 of 2004

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the
management of Bastacolla Area of
M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the O.P. : Mr. U.N. Lal,
Employers Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 17th August, 2005

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/122/2004-I.R. (C-I), dated the 2nd September, 2004.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the BCKU from the management of Bastacolla Colliery of M/s. BCCL, Bastacolla Area P.O. Jharia, Distt. Dhanbad for providing employment to Shri Manjura Manjhi S/o Late Lakhiram Manjhi, Ex-Loading Mazdoor as per the provision of NCWA-V/V is proper and justified? If so, to what relief is the said dependent of the deceased workman entitled?"

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal.

Management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires from the record that in spite of issuance of notices and show cause notice consecutively the workman/sponsoring union failed to turn up before this Tribunal. Under Rule 10(B) of the I.D. Central Rules, 1957 it is mandatory on the part of the concerned workman/sponsoring union to file Written Statement complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses within 15 days from the date of receipt of the order of reference. The concerned workman/sponsoring union not only violated the above rule but also even did not consider necessary to respond to the notices issued by the Tribunal. Gesture of the workman/sponsoring union if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances, this Tribunal also finds no reason to adjourn the case *suo moto* for taking steps by the workman/sponsoring union. Hence, the case is closed and accordingly a 'No dispute' Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3635.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 109/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/106/2004-आई आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3635.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 109/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/106/2004-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(I)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 109 of 2004

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Sudamdih Incline Mine of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None
On behalf of the employers : Mr. U. N. Lal, Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 17th August, 2005

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/106/2004-I.R. (C-I), dated the 2nd September, 2004.

SCHEDULE

"Kya Bharat Coking Coal Limited Sudamdih Incline Mine Kya Pravandtantra Dwara Karmkar Shri Uttam Rai Miner/Loader ko Dinank 2-8-2003 Sey Seva Sey Barkhast Kiya Jana Uchit, Vidhivat Evam Nayasangat Hai? Yadi Nahi to Karmkar Kis Rahat Key Patra Hai?"

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. Management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. Record shows that in spite of issuance of notices and show cause notice consecutively the workman/sponsoring union failed to turn up before this Tribunal in the matter of taking steps in the instant reference case. As per Rule 10(B) of the I.D. Central Rules 1957 it is mandatory to file Written Statement, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses on the part of the concerned workman/sponsoring union within 15 days from the date of receipt of the order of reference. The workman/sponsoring union not only violated the above provision of rule but also did not consider necessary to respond to the notices issued by this Tribunal. Gesture of the workman/sponsoring union if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under the circumstances, this Tribunal also finds no reason to adjourn the case *suo moto* for days together. Hence, the case is closed and accordingly a 'No dispute' Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3636.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सी. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 149/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/210/2000-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3636.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 149/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure. in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of CCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/210/2000-IR (C-1)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No.-2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 149 of 2000

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of M/s. CCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : Mr. C.S. Pathak, Authorised Representative.

On behalf of the employers : Mr. D.K. Verma, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 16th August, 2005.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/210/2000 (C-I), dated, the 30th October, 2000.

SCHEDULE

"KYA UNITED COAL WORKERS UNION KI MANG KI SHRIDAMODAR LAL RAM KO VARSH 1991 SEY TIMEKEEPER/CLERK GRADE-III KEY PAD PAR NIYAMIT KIYA JAYA UCHIT EVAM NAYASANGAT HAI ? YADI HA TO HIS

SAMBANDH MEY KYA NIRDESH AVASHYAK HAI ?"

In this case both the parties appeared through their authorised representatives and filed their respective Written Statements, documents etc. The case then proceeded along its course. However, in course of hearing the authorised representative of the sponsoring union by filing a petition submitted his prayer to pass a 'No dispute' Award in this reference as the concerned workman involved in this dispute is not interested with further hearing of this case. The representative of the management raised no objection in view of the prayer made on the side of the workman/sponsoring union. When the concerned workman/sponsoring union is not interested to proceed with the hearing of the case there is no reason at all to drag on the case for days together. Accordingly in view of the submission of the representative of the workman/sponsoring union and as no objection raised on the side of the management a 'No dispute' Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3637.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा. को. को. लि प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 100/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/34/2003-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3637.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 100/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure. in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/34/2003-IR (C-1)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 100 of 2004

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. D.K. Verma, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 16th August, 2005.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/34/2003 IR (C-I), dated, the 4th March 2004.

SCHEDULE

“KYA BHARAT COKING COAL LIMITED CIVIL ENGINEERING KOYALA BHAVAN KOYALA NAGAR EVAM GONDUDIH COLLIERY KEY PRAVANDHTANTRA DWARA KARMKAR SHRI NANKA BHUIA KO CIVIL ENGINEERING BIVAG SEY GONDUDIH COLLIERY MEY AADESH DINANK 9-7-92 DWARA STHANANTARIT KIYA JANNEY PAR UNHEY DONO MEY SEY KISI VI STHAN PAR DUTY JOIN NA KARWAYA JANA SAHI EVAM NAYASANGAT HAI ? YADI NAHI TOUKT KARMKARKIS RAHATKEY PATRA HAI TATHA KIS TARIKH SEY ?”

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. Management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires from the record that in spite of issuance of notices and show cause notice consecutively the workman/sponsoring union failed to turn up before this Tribunal in the matter of taking steps in the instant reference case. As per Rule 10(B) of the I.D. Central Rules, 1957 it is mandatory to file Written Statement, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses on the part of the concerned workman/sponsoring union within 15 days from the date of receipt of the order of reference. The workman/sponsoring union not only violated the above provision of rule but also did not consider necessary to respond to the notices issued by this Tribunal. Gesture of the workman/sponsoring union if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under the circumstances, this Tribunal also finds no reason to adjourn the case suo moto for days together. Hence, the case is closed and accordingly a “No dispute” Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3638.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसको के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध

में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ब्रम् न्यायालय, धनबाद II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 123/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/263/2002-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3638.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 123/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of IISCO and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/263/2002-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)
AT DHANBAD**

PRESENT:

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under
Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 123 of 2003

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of M/s. IISCO'S JITPUR Colliery and their workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. D.K. Verma, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dhanbad, the 16th August, 2005

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/263/2002 IR (C-I), dated, the 10th November, 2003.

SCHEDULE

“KYA JANTA MAZDOOR SANGH KO IISCOO JITPUR COLLIERY KEY PRAVANDHTANTRA SEY MANG KI S/SHRE JAMIR AKHTAR, SENIOR OVERMAN, JAMIL AKHTAR, R.D. DUTTA EVAM NANDURAM, ASSTT. FOREMAN KO 1-1-97 SEY S.L.U. DIYA JAYE UCHIT EVAM NAYASANGAT HAI ? YADI HAN TO SAMANDHIT KARMAKAR KIS RAHATKEY PATRA HAI ?”

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal.

Management, however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It transpires the record that inspite of issuance of notices and show cause notice consecutively the workman/sponsoring union failed to turn up before this Tribunal in the matter of taking steps in the instant reference case. As per Rule 10(B) of the I.D. Central Rules, 1957 it is mandatory to file Written Statement, complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses on the part of the concerned workman/sponsoring union within 15 days from the date of receipt of the order of reference. The workman/sponsoring union not only violated the above provision of rule but also did not consider necessary to respond to the notices issued by this Tribunal. Attitude of the workman/sponsoring union if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of the case. Under the circumstances, this Tribunal also finds no ground to adjourn the case suo moto for days together. Hence, the case is closed and accordingly a "No dispute" Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3639.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सी एम पी डी आई एल के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद II के पंचाट (Comp No. 1/2001) (Arising out of Ref No. 128/93) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/63/92-आई आर (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3639.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Comp No. 1/2001) (Arising out of Ref No. 128/93) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad II now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation of management of CMPDIL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-20012/63/92-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)

AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the
I.D. Act, 1947.

(Arising out of Ref. No. 128 of 1993—Ministry's Order
No. L-20012(63)/92-IR-Coal-I dt 6-9-93).

COMPLAINT NO. 1 of 2001

PARTIES : Shri Sudhir Ram S/o. Bigu Nayak Draftsman
(Mech.) E & M Deptt. CMPDI Ltd. Gondwana
Place, Kanke Road, Ranchi-834008

...Complainant

Versus

Employers in relation to the management of
Central Mine Planning & Design Institute
Ltd., Gondwana Place, Kanke Road, Ranchi,
and 3 others.

...O. Ps.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the : Mr. Sudhir Kumar,
Complainant Complainant himself.
On behalf of the O.Ps. : Mr. A. K. Mishra,
Personnel Officer.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Mine Planning.

Dated, the 16th August, 2005

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act., 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.Ps mentioned above.

In course of hearing of the instant complaint case the complainant by filing a petition submitted his prayer to withdraw the complaint case. No objection raised on behalf of the O.Ps in view of the prayer submitted by the complainant. Under the circumstances, there is no reason to drag on the case further. In the result, the complaint case is dismissed as withdrawn.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3640.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ. एन. जी. सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 78/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/89/2005-आई आर (विचि)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3640.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 78

04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to management of O.N.G.C.Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/89/2005-IR (M)]

C. GANGANDHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

Com C.G.I.T. A No. 78/04 In Reference no. C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 32/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

Rejendra Kumar
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384002. ...Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. ...Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Disputes Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R.&P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002

on 15/05/2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is till founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act., The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R&P policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex.6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date: 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3641.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ. एन. जी. सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/त्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (79/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/90/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3641.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (79/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workman, received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/90/2005-IR (M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. I. Kazi, B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

Com C.G.I.T.A No. 79/04 In Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 33/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

P. R. Acharya
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002. ...Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. ...Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who complete six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition.

Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R&P rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be changed till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R&P rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R&P rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15/05/2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is till founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act., The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R&P regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R&P policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex.6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date: 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3642.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ. एन. जी. सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (80/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/91/2005-आई आर (विधि)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3642.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (80/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C.Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/91/2005-IR (M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. I. Kazi, B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

Com C.G.I.T. A No. 80/04 In Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 34/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

A. R. Shah .

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002. ...Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248 003.

...Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who complete six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R.&P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is till founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act., The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99.

There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex.6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date: 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3643.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ. एन. जी. सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधकों के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 81/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/92/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3643.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 81/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure, in the

Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C.Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/92/2005-IR (M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

Com C.G.I.T. A No. 81/04 In Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 35/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

J. N. Patel

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association.

19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,

Mahešana-384002

... Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),

ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,

Dehradun-248003

... Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who complete six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R.&P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated

their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No.1 RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is till founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act., The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex.6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad:

Date : 17-01-2005

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3644.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ. एन. जी. सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ 82/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/93/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3644.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (82/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C.Ltd. and their workman, received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/93/2005-IR (M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

Com C.G.I.T. A No. 82/04 In Reference No. C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04

(Old Com. No. 36/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99

Nilesh H. Malvi

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002

... Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003

... Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla
Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R.&P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is till founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that

the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date: 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3645.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 83/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[फा. सं. एल-30025/94/2005-आई.आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3645.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 83/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[F.No. L-30025/94/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AT AHMEDABAD**

PRESENT : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer
Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 83/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 37/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]

S.G. Vasava,

C/o. ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384002. . . . Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. . . . Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33-A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-05

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3646.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 84/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[फा. सं. एल-30025/95/2005-आई आर (विधि)]

सी. गंगाधर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3646.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 84/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[F.No. L-30025/95/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AT AHMEDABAD**

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer
Com: C.G.I.T.A. No. 84/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 (Old Com. No. 38/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99)

S. K. Bhavasar,

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384002. Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. Opponent

Appearances

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of

change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Offr.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-2005

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3647.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 85/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[फा. सं. एल-30025/96/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3647.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 85/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[F. No. L-30025/96/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer
Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 85/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 (Old Com. No. 38/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99)

G.A. Ramtekar

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002. Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Teibhavan,
Dehradun-248003. Opponent

Appearances

Complainant : Shri R. C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to

desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a pursish by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3648.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधकों के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 86/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/97/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3648.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 86/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/97/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 86/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 (Old Com. No. 40/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99)

V. S. Patel

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002.

... Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003.

... Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference

(ITC) No: 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3649.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 87/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/98/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3649.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 87/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the

Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/98/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., LL.M., Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 87/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 (Old Com. No. 41/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99)

J. J. Patel;

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002. Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R. C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K. V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category

workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3650 .—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 88/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/99/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3650.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 88/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/99/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M. Presiding
Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 84/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 (Old Com. No. 42/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99)

V.B. Patel

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002. Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd. Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion

policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The Management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer *Vide* file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not

recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3651.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अथवा न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 89/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/100/2005-आई आर (विधि)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3651.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 89/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/100/2005-IR(M)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AT AHMEDABAD**

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 89/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 [Old Com. No. 43/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]

H.V. Oza

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpakunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002. Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003. Opponent

Appearances

Complainant : Shri R. C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-5-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act. 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any

action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33, of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed of accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R. & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed of No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-1-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3652.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 90/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/101/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3652.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 90/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/101/2005-IR(Mis.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M.
Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 90/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 [Old Com. No. 44/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]

M.J. Modi
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff
Association, 19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sahkar Nagar, Mahesana-384 002Complainant
V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003.Opponent

Appearances :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla
Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to

desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. and P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R. & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-2005

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3653 .—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 91/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/102/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3653 .—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 91/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/102/2005-IR(Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

Present : SHRI B.I. KAZI B. Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 91/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 [Old Com. No. 45/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

B. B. Patel

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff

Association, 19, Pushpkunj Society,

Near Sahkar Nagar, Mahesana-384 002 ... Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003.

...Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide File No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (I.T.C) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion

the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-01-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3654.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 92/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/103/2005-आई आर (त्रिविध)]

सी. गंगधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3654.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 92/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/103/2005-IR(Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L. M, Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 92/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 [Old Com. No. 46/03 in Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

J. C. Parmar

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association, 19, Pushpkunj Society, Near Sahkar Nagar, Mahesana-384 002 Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248 003.

... Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K. V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. and P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R. & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-02-05

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3655.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधांतर के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के

बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 93/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/104/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3655.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 93/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/104/2005-IR(Misc)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi, B. Sc., L.L.M.,
Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 93/04, in Reference No.
C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 47/03, in Reference (I.T.C.) No.
120/99]

K. K. Thakor,

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff
Association, 19, Pushpkunj Society,

Near Sahkar Nagar, Mahesana-384 002Complainant
V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248 003.

...Opponent

Appearances :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify

R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15/05/2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by

the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-02-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3656.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 94/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/105/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3656.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 94/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/105/2005-IR(Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M.
Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 94/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 (Old Com. No. 48/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99)

N.G. Patel.

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff
Association, 19. Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sahkar Nagar, Mahesana-384 002Complainant

I/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd, Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003.

...Opponent

APPEARANCES :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla
Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)/2002 on 15-5-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change

any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R. & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-02-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3657.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ. एन. जी. सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 95/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30025/106/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3657.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 95/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/106/2005-IR(Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
AT AHMEDABAD**

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B. Sc., L.L.M.
Presiding Officer

**Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 95/04 in Reference No. C.G.I.T.A.
No. 201/04 [Old Com. No. 49/03 in Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]**

M.B. Patel,

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff,
Association, 19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sahkar Nagar, Mahesana-384002Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248003.Opponent

Appearances

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist from any

action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension—assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R. & P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R. & P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R & P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex., 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order :

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Date : 17-2-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3658.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 96/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल.-30025/107/2005-आई. आर. (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3658.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. [96/2004] of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/107/2005-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer.

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 96/04 In Reference
No. C.G. I.T.A. No. 201/04

(Old Com. No. 50/03 In Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99)

H.N. Patel,
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sahakar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002.Complainant

Vs.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehrandun-248 003Opponent

Appearances

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent

should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R.& P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through Conciliation Officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)/2002 on 15-5-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complaint is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complainant is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complainant may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6 this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 17-02-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3659.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 97/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-08-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल.-30025/108/2005-आई. आर. (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3659.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 97/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 30-08-2005:

[No. L-30025/108/2005-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 97/04 In Reference No. C.G.

L.T.A. No. 201/04

[Old Com No. 51/03 In Reference (I.T.C.)

No. 120/99]

Fatak M.Y.

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002.Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd.,
Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248 003Opponent

APPEARANCES:

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R. & P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R. & P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)/2002 on 15/05/2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue and order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical and Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The

complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complainant is required to be dismissed. The complainant is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complainant is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed of accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6 this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 17-02-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3660.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसार में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाद (संदर्भ संख्या 98/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-08-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल.-30025/109/2005-आई. आर. (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3660.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 98/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 30-08-2005.

[No. L-30025/109/2005-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M. Presiding Officer.

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 98/04 In Reference No.
C.G. I.T.A. No. 201/04

[Old Com No. 52/03 In Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]

N.B. Parekh

C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sahkar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002.

....Complainant

Vs.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehradun-248 003

....Opponent

Appearances:

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change i. service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P.

rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)/2002 on 15/05/2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complainant is required to be dismissed. The complainant is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complainant is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complainant are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complainant should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complainant may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 17-02-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3661.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पञ्चाट (संदर्भ संख्या 99/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-08-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-30025/110/2005-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3661.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 99/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30025/110/2005-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi, B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer.

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 99/04 In Reference No. C.G. I.T.A. No. 201/04

[Old Com No. 53/03 In Reference (I.T.C.) No. 120/99]

K.B. Modi
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sakhar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002

....Complainant

Vs.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd.,
Telbhavan,
Dehrandun-248 003

....Opponent

Appearances :

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)/2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per Section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue and order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33

of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complainant should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of Section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 17-02-05

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3662.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 100/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल.-30025/111/2005-आईआर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3662.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 100/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 30-08-2005.

[No. L-30025/111/2005-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT
AHMEDABAD**

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi, B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer.
Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 100/04 In Reference No. C.G. I.T.A.
No. 201/04

[Old Com No. 54/03 In Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]

V.B. Parekh
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sakhar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002.Complainant

V/s.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehrandun-248 003Opponent

Appearances.

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R. & P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years, the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(I)/2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9-A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue an order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement.

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not

connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject-matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject-matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 17-02-05

Sd/-

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3663.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 101/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-08-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल.-30025/112/2005-आई.आर. (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3663.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 101/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd., and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 30-08-2005.

[No. L-30025/112/2005-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

Present : Shri B.I. Kazi B.Sc., L.L.M.
Presiding Officer.

Com. C.G.I.T.A. No. 101/04 In Reference No. C.G. I.T.A.
No. 201/04

[Old Com. No. 55/03 In Reference (I.T.C.)
No. 120/99]

M.B. Rav
C/o ONGC Electrical & Allied Staff Association,
19, Pushpkunj Society,
Near Sakhar Nagar,
Mahesana-384 002.Complainant

Vs.

The Director (Personnel/HR),
ONGC Ltd., Telbhavan,
Dehrandun-248 003Opponent

Appearances:

Complainant : Shri R.C. Shukla

Opponent : Shri K.V. Gadhia

ORDER

1. The complainant has filed this complaint Under Section 33 A of the Industrial Dispute Act, praying that the opponent shall not change time bound promotion policy, in which a workman who completes six years of service in one post will get the promotion to next higher post. It is the say of the complainant that change of time bound promotion policy is a change of service condition. Hence prays that the opponent should be ordered to desist from any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category and the service condition should not be change till the pending of reference case.

2. The brief facts of the complainant is that the Reference is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal C.G.I.T.A. No. 201/04 as a Old I.T.C. No. 120/99 for adjudication. The management of O.N.G.C. trying to modify R.& P. rules without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association. The action will change the service condition of Electrical category workman who are involved in the reference. As per the present R.&P. rules after completing of six years. the workman is getting promotion to next higher post and it is the time bound promotion policy and it is also service condition of the workman. The management have intimated their intention of change of time bound policy to the union through conciliation officer vide file No. RLC/AH/50(1)/

2002 on 15-05-2002 a copy is enclosed as Annexure "B". Thus the intention of change of time bound promotion policy is change of service condition as per section 9A and Schedule-IV of I.D. Act, 1947. Thus it is prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal shall issue and order to opposite party to desist for any action of modifying R.&P. rules for electrical category workman without the consent of Electrical & Allied Staff Association and not to change the service condition till the Reference 120/99 is finalized.

3. A notice was issued to the opponent to file the Written Statement:

4. By Ex. 5 the opponent has filed the Written Statement. The brief facts are that complaint is not maintainable at law and the Hon'ble Tribunal has no jurisdiction. The complaint is ill founded and made on assumption. The opponent has not contravened any provisions of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. The complainant is not concerned workman and alleged dispute is not connected with the main reference. Hence the complaint is required to be dismissed. The complaint is not maintainable at law, as it is filed on the ground of apprehension-assumption. The subject-matter of present complaint is not connected with the pending Reference (ITC) No. 120/99. There is no such demand promotion in the main reference. The averments and contention made in the complaint are not true, hence denied by the opponent. It is denied that the management is trying to modify recruitment and promotion rules with the other union. It is the privilege of the management to change any rule. It is denied that there will be change of any service conditions of the complainant. The management calls recognized unions and ASTD for the discussion for changing the R.&P. regulations and the union is not recognized union and their union has not a legal right to say anything about R.&P. The complainant has not produced any proof of contravention of Section 33 of the I.D. Act. Thus it is prayed that the complaint should be dismissed with cost.

5. During the course of adjudication the representative of the complainant submitted a purshis by Ex. 6 and it is stated that the matter is settled with the management. Hence the present complaint may be disposed off accordingly.

6. Looking to the facts of this purshis Ex. 6, it is clear that the matter has been settled amicably and there is no grievance of the complainant regarding changing the R.&P. policy. Not only that the opponent has not committed any breach of section 33. Thus there is no violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Dispute Act by the opponent. Looking to the Ex. 6, this complaint become infructuous and does not survive in law. Hence I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of the fact of Ex. 6 the parties have amicable settlement regarding the subject-matter of the complaint. Hence this complaint is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad.

Dated : 17-02-05

Sd/-

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3664.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एच.एम.पी. सीमेन्ट्स लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1025/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 31-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/36/1996-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3664.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 1025/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of H.M.P. Cements Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 31-8-2005.

[No. L-29012/36/1996-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD****PRESENT:**

SHRI B.I. KAZI, B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 1025/04

(Old ITC No. 42/96 transferred from I.T. Ahmedabad)

General Manager,First Party
H.M.P. Cements Ltd.,
Porbandar Cements Works,
Aerodrome Road, Porbandar

Versus

Shri Harijan Chandu Bhiku Vadher, Second Party
Nagnidas Modi Plot, Ward No. 5,
Sheri No. 6, Old Harijan Vas,
Porbandar.

APPEARANCES:

First Party : V.K. Pandya

Second Party : Absent

AWARD

1. The Government of India has referred the Industrial Dispute between the above parties by order No. L-29012/36/96-IR (Misc.) dated 3-10-96 to this Tribunal for adjudication. The terms of reference is as under.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the General Manager, H.M.P. Cements Ltd., Porbandar Cement Works Porbandar in not taking on duties/discontinuance/terminating the service of S/Shri Candu Bhikhu Vadher, Sweeper, at General Manager and Inspection Bungalow and Shri Rabari Raiya Bhura, Mali in company's colony premises respectively w.e.f. 26-10-95 and not regularizing them is just, valid and legal?" If, not to what benefits the employees are entitled?"

2. The second party was issued a notice to file the statement of claim by this Tribunal on 18-10-96. The date to file the statement of claim was 23-12-96. The appropriate Government has also directed second party who raised the dispute to file the statement of claim with relevant document and list of reliance and witness to the Tribunal within 15 days of the date of the order.

3. However, the proper opportunity was given by this Tribunal to file a statement of claim to the second party. The second party failed to submit the statement of claim after 9 years from the date of reference. Thus this Tribunal has reason to believe that the second party is not interest in dispute. Thus the second party has failed to prove the justness and legalness of his demand.

Looking to the above observation, I hereby pass the following order.

ORDER

The action of the General Manager, H.M.P. Cements Ltd., Porbandar Cement Works, Porbandar in not taking on duties/discontinuance/terminating the services of S/Shri Chandu Bhikhu Vadher, Sweeper at General Manager and Inspection Bungalow and Shri Rabari Raiya Bhura, Mali in company's colony premises respectively w.e.f. 26-10-95 and not regularising them is just, valid and legal. The workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

B.I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3665.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ओ.एन.जी.सी. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 692/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-8-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/12/1999-आई आर (विविध)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2005

S.O. 3665.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 692/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour

Court, Ahmedabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of O.N.G.C. Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-8-2005.

[No. L-30011/12/1999-IR (Misc.)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT AHMEDABAD

PRESENT :

SHRI B.L. KAZI, B.Sc., L.L.M., Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 692/04

(Old ITC No. 26/99 transferred from LT. Ahmedabad)

1. The Executive Director,
ONGC Ltd., W.R.B.C.
Makarpura Road,
Baroda-390009. ... First Party
2. M/s. Sivam Construction
F/7, 2, Nandavan Society
Susen Ring Road,
Tarsali Baroda.
3. M/s. Kharwa & Sons,
Bhavdas Mohalla,
Kharwa Vad, Shiya Baug,
Baroda.
4. The President,
M/s. Unnati Towers,
ONGC Colony, ONGC Ltd.,
Makarpura, Baroda

Versus

The Legal Secretary,
Bharatiya Karmachari Sangh,
Shastri Pole Koti Char Rasta,
Baroda-390001 ... Second Party

APPEARANCES:

First Party : Absent
Second Party : Absent

AWARD

1. The Government of India has referred the Industrial Dispute between the above parties by order No. L-30011/12/99-IR (Misc.) dated 16-2-1999 to this Tribunal for adjudication. The terms of reference is as under.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the contract between ONGC Ltd., Baroda and the contractors M/s. Shivam Constructions, M/s. Kharwa & Sons & M/s. Unnati Towers in

respect of Shri Indravadan C. Rathod Shri Rathva Amasinhbhai Bavlabhai, Shri Tati Ramnarayan Mal Bhogidas, Shri Talti Indalbhahi Mal and bogus contract entered into as a camouflage to avoid the provisions of Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act, 1970?"

"Whether the demand of the Union in respect of 5 contractual workmen (mentioned here in above) engaged through various contractors and the non-registered Association of persons in the establishment of ONGC Ltd. for treating these contract workmen as 'direct and regular' employees of through various contractors and the non-registered Association of persons in the establishment of ONGC Ltd. for treating these contracts workmen as 'direct and regular' employees of ONGC Ltd. for the date of their joining either with ONGC Ltd. or any of the labour contractors/non-registered Association of persons is legal and justified? If so, to what relief these 5 contractual workmen are entitled and from which date and what other directions are necessary in the matter?"

Whether the demand of the union in respect of the above mentioned 5 contractual workmen (mentioned herein above) for making the payment of arrears of wages, DA, VDA, HRA and other fringe benefits at par with the regular employees of ONGC Ltd., as per their categories and to make the payment of amount of overtime these contract workmen for the extra work performed by them is legal and justified? If so to what relief these contract workman are entitled and from which date?"

2. The second party was issued a notice to file the statement of claim by this Tribunal on 7-9-99. The date to file the statement of claim was 15-9-99. The appropriate Government has also directed the second party was raised the dispute to file of statement of claim with relevant document and list of reliance and witness to the Tribunal within 15 days of the date of receipt of the order.

3. However, the proper opportunity was given by this Tribunal to file a statement of claim to the second party. The second party failed to submit the statement of claim after 5 years from the date of reference. Thus this Tribunal was reason to believe that the second party is not interested in the dispute. Thus the second party has failed to prove the justness of demand.

Looking to the above observation, I hereby pass the following order.

ORDER

The reference is hereby rejected for want of non prosecution of the second party union. The second party is not entitled to any relief as claimed in the terms of reference. The reference is hereby disposed off. No order as to cost.

Ahmedabad

Dated: 17-1-2005

B. I. KAZI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2004

AWARD**Passed on this 4th day of September, 2005**

का. अ. 3666.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंदौर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एलसी/आर/78/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-09-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/295/2002-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3666.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/78/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Indore and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 15-09-2005.

[No. L-12012/295/2002-IR (B. I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**LOK ADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005—THE SUNDAY****THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR**

No. CGIT/LC/R/78/2003

Presiding Officer : Shri C. M. Singh

The General Secretary,
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,
9, Sanwer Road,
Ujjain (MP)

.... Workman/Union

Versus

The General Manager (Operations),
State Bank of Indore, Head Office,
5, Yeshwant Niwas Road,
Indore (MP).

... Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Shri C.M. Singh,
Presiding Officer,
CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. Shri R.C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. Shri Ashish Agrawal,
Advocate | Member |

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/295/2002/IR(B-I) dated 28-3-03 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of General Manager (O), State Bank of Indore in not paying the scale wages as per Bipartite Settlement in r/o Smt. Meera Bai & Smt. Shakuntala Bai is justified? If not, to what these workwomen are entitled for?”

2. In this reference, Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary of the Union counsel for workmen Smt. Meera Bai and Smt. Shakuntala Bai/Union has moved an application with the prayer that both the ladies named above do not want to prosecute this reference and therefore this reference be dropped at this stage. It is mentioned in the body of the aforesaid application that Smt. Meera Bai and Smt. Shakuntala Bai have attained the age of more than 60 years. That Smt. Meera Bai due to her old age is incapable to work. That the management of the Bank during the pendency of this reference considering poor financial condition of Smt. Shakuntala Bai has employed her son Shri Manoj Bai in her place.

3. As mentioned above, the same has been submitted by Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain (MP) before this Lok Adalat. Shri S.K. Rao, Sr. Advocate for the management has no objection to the aforesaid submission made by Shri Ram Nagvanshi. Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the learned counsel for the workmen/Union submitted that both the ladies do not want to prosecute this reference and therefore the reference be closed. Shri S.K. Rao, the learned counsel for the management submitted that he has no objection if the reference is closed and a No Dispute Award is passed.

4. It is quite clear from the above that there is left no dispute between the parties and therefore the workmen/Union do not want to prosecute this reference. It is also clear from the above that both the parties have compromised the matter. In view of it, No Dispute Award is passed without any order as to costs.

5. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. अ. 3667.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंदौर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एलसी/आर/10/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-09-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/306/99-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3667.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/10/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Indore and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 15-09-2005.

[No. L-12012/306/99-IR (B. I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

LOK ADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005—THE SUNDAY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/10/2000

Presiding Officer : C. M. Singh

Shri Ram Nagvanshi,
The General Secretary,
Dainik Vetan Bhogi Bank Karamchari Sangathan,
9, Sanwer Road, Hardev Niwas,
Ujjain (MP) Workman/Union

Versus

The Assistant General Manager,
State Bank of Indore, Roor House,
4, Maharana Pratap Nagar, Zone No. 2,
Bhopal (MP). ... Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Shri C.M. Singh,
Presiding Officer,
CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. Shri R.C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. Shri Ashish Agrawal,
Advocate | Member |

AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of September, 2005

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/306/99/IR(B-I) dated 23/24-12-99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in not regularising the services of Shri Babulal Parmar is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. In this reference, an application has been moved by Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary of the Union counsel for workmen/Union with the prayer that the

workman/Union does not want to prosecute this reference and therefore the reference be dropped at this stage. It is also mentioned in the body of this application that during the pendency of this reference, the management having considered the poor financial condition of the workman has taken him back in service..

3. Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary, Daily Wages Employees Association, Ujjain, MP the counsel for workman Shri Babulal Parmar/Union and Shri S.K. Rao Sr. Advocate the learned counsel for the management jointly submitted that during the pendency of this reference considering the financial condition of workman Shri Babulal Parmar, the management of State Bank of Indore has again employed him in service and therefore the workman/Union does not want to prosecute this reference. Both the learned counsel for the parties submitted that now there is left no dispute between the parties and therefore a No Dispute Award be passed in the reference.

4. It is crystally clear from the above that the matter has been compromised between the parties and the workman/Union therefore does not want to prosecute this reference. In view of the above, No Dispute Award is passed without any order as to costs.

5. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. . 3668.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एलसी/आर/59/96) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-09-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/115/95-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3668.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/59/96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 15-09-2005.

[No. L-12012/115/95-IR (B. I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/59/96

SHRI C.M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

Shri Jagjiwan Lal Patel, Workman
S/o Shri Anupam Ram Patel,
Village Barula, Tehsil Gariyaband,
Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh

Versus

Assistant General Manager, ... Management
State Bank of India, Region-I,
Zonal Office, Shankar Nagar,
Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh

AWARD

Passed on this 30th day of August, 2005

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/115/95/IR(B-I) dated 23-2-96 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in relation to their Branch at Barula in terminating the services of Sh. Jagjiwan Lal Patel, S/o Sh. Anupam Ram Patel, Messenger is justified? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?”

2. The case of the applicant in brief is as follows. Applicant Shri Jagjiwan Lal Patel was appointed as messenger temporarily at Sorikhurd branch of State Bank of India, Region-I, Zonal Office, Shankar Nagar, Raipur (the management) w.e.f. 1-1-89 to 4-5-89, thereafter again he was appointed as messenger on temporary basis at Bamhni branch of the management w.e.f. 5-6-89 to 31-7-89. He was further appointed on the same terms and conditions on the same post at Barula Branch w.e.f. 29-3-90 to 7-12-93. The applicant had actually worked with the management in the year 1989 for about 162 days continuously and the year between March 1990 to December 1993 for about 1346 days continuously. Thus the applicant had worked continuously for more than 240 days with the management. That in all times of appointment, the applicant was interviewed and selected by the concerned Branch Manager of the Bank. At the time of appointment he was given to understand that initially the appointment shall be temporary and after six months, he shall be made permanent on the post. The post of messenger in all the branches are the permanent post and the appointment of the applicant in Barula branch was against a clear vacant post of messenger. That as per Shastri Award, the applicant after having

continuously worked for three months/six months his appointment need to have been regularised on the permanent post and he was also entitled for regular salary and other emoluments connected thereto. In the service, the applicant was drawing basic wages + D.A. + HRA, approximately Rs. 1770 per months through vouchers. The services of the applicant was suddenly discontinued w.e.f. 8-12-93 without any reason or without showing any cause. The applicant had actually acquired the status of permanent employee and his services could not be terminated without showing any reason or without issuing any chargesheet for misconduct or conducting any departmental enquiry against him. That he was also not given any show cause notice before termination of his services. That the applicant was also not provided with any termination order. That the management prior to terminating the services of the applicant had not followed the provisions of Sec-25-F of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 (hereinafter referred as Act only) which is a mandatory provision. That during the pendency of this reference, the applicant was interviewed on 25-2-97 for the vacant post of messenger and he was successfully selected for the said post but was not given any appointment order till date and the management is forcing him to withdraw the present reference case so that he may not claim his reinstatement with back wages. This act of the management clearly shows their mala fide intentions. The act of the management of terminating the services of the applicant is mala fide, capricious against the principle of natural justice and void-ab-initio. Therefore the termination of services of the applicant is liable to be struck down and is liable to be set aside. It is prayed by the applicant that the management be directed to reinstate the applicant on the post of messenger on permanent basis with all back wages from the date of termination with all consequential benefits and be also directed to pay the cost of this proceedings.

3. The management resisted the reference and filed their Written Statement. The management in their written statement denied the entire averments made by the applicant in his statement of claim. The case of the management in brief is as follows. The applicant was engaged temporarily on daily wages for a limited period for an essential temporary work in the Sorikhurd Branch of the management w.e.f. 1-1-89 to 4-5-89 and then again at the Sorikhurd Branch w.e.f. 5-6-89 to 31-7-89. This was an engagement made intermittently and temporarily for a temporary increase of work. He was again engaged temporarily at Barula Branch w.e.f. 29-3-90 on which date the branch was opened with the specific condition that his engagement would end automatically on posting of a permanent employee. The appointment, service condition of such staff are governed not only by Shastri Award or Desai Award but also by Bi-Parite Agreement entered into between the management of the Bank and the Staff Federation from time to time. The term temporary employee is defined in clause-508 of the Shastri Award as under :—

“508(C) ‘Temporary Employee’ means an employee who has been appointed for a limited period for work

which is of an essentially temporary nature or who is employed temporarily as an additional employee in connection with a temporary increase in work of a permanent nature."

4. That Shri V.P. Yadav a permanent messenger at Dhamtari Branch was posted to Barula Branch vide order dated 17-12-90 but he reported for duty on 11-10-93. Thus the engagement of applicant which was made specifically with the condition of automatic termination on posting of a permanent person at Barula Branch automatically came to end on 11-10-93. On this own request, he was allowed to continue for 2 months more looking to his family condition and also in view of the agreement entered into between the management and the staff of Bank Federation whereby there could be a chance for his appointment as permanent part-time employee. Since the applicant is only a daily wage employee and has no right to the post, his disengagement is not arbitrary. The Branch Manager is not empowered to interview, select and appoint any person as messenger in the Bank. That a settlement was entered into between the management and the Staff Federation on 17-11-87 under the Act which provide criteria for consideration of persons who have worked in the Bank even for some period. This settlement was further modified in 1988 and 1991. The applicant though did not fulfill the criteria, he was called for interview and offered a permanent Part-time employee's appointment by order dated 31-7-97 and he was directed to report for duty by 15-8-97 in the Hirni Branch of State Bank of India, but he did not report. The term permanent Employee has been defined in clause 508-A of the Shastri Award as under :—

"508(a) 'Permanent Employee' means an employee who has been appointed as such by the bank."

It is emphatically denied by the management in their Written Statement that the applicant has been asked to withdraw the reference. It is admitted by the management that the applicant was interviewed on 25-2-97 and offered an employment on the post of permanent part-time messenger but he did not report for duty. That from the facts pleaded above it is clear that the applicant is not entitled to any relief.

5. The applicant in order to prove his case examined himself as WW-1. The management for resisting the reference examined Shri U.K. Shah, MW-1, the then Manager (P & HRD) SBI Region-I Zonal Office Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

6. Both the parties also filed Photostat copies of certain documents in support of their respective contentions which shall be referred in the body of this award at appropriate places where the need be.

7. I have heard Shri A.K. Shashi, Advocate for workman and Shri Prashant Saprey, Advocate for management.

8. I have very carefully gone through the written argument submitted by the parties and the entire evidence on record.

FINDINGS

9. It has been admitted by the management in their Written Statement that the applicant was engaged temporarily in Sorikhurd branch of the management w.e.f. 1-1-89 to 4-5-89 and then again at the same branch w.e.f. 5-6-89 to 31-7-89 and he was again engaged temporarily at Barula branch w.e.f. 29-3-90 to 7-12-93. It has been pleaded on behalf of the management that the applicant was engaged temporarily at Barula branch w.e.f. 29-3-90 the date on which the branch was opened with the specific condition that his engagement would end automatically on posting of a permanent employee and thus on 11-10-93, automatic termination of applicant took place on joining Shri V. P. Yadav a permanent messenger who was posted vide order dated 17-12-90. It has also been pleaded on behalf of the management that the applicant was allowed to continue for 2 months more on his own request and looking to his family condition and also in view of the agreement entered into between the management and the staff of Bank Federation whereby there could be a chance for his appointment as part-time employee. Shri V. K. Shah MW-1 deposed the above in his affidavit Shri Jagjiwan Lal Patel as WW-1 stated on oath in the evidence of his cross-examination that it is wrong to say that he was appointed at Barula branch with the condition that when any permanent messenger will join, his termination from service would automatically take place. The management has filed Photostat copy of memorandum dated 5-4-90 Exhibit M-1 which reveals that the applicant was appointed as a temporary messenger at Barula branch for a period from 29-3-90 to 4-5-90 subject to terms mentioned therein. I have gone through Exhibit M-1 very carefully. There are 3 terms mentioned as Sl. No. I, II & III in the aforesaid memorandum. It is not mentioned in the said appointment order that the applicant was temporarily appointed with the specific condition that his engagement would end automatically on posting of a permanent employee. The learned counsel for the workman has rightly submitted that it is not proved from the evidence on record that the applicant was engaged temporarily at Barula branch with the specific condition that his engagement would end automatically on posting of a permanent employee. The documentary evidence contained in copy of memorandum (letter of appointment) Exhibit M-1 together with the oral evidence deposed by the applicant Jagjiwan Lal Patel WW-1 in his cross-examination clearly proves that he was not appointed at Barula branch with the specific condition that his engagement would come to an end on posting of a permanent messenger. The learned counsel for the workman further submitted that the documentary evidence on record proves the fact that the applicant was appointed as a temporary messenger at Barula branch on 29-3-90 on monthly salary of Rs. 430 basic pay + allowance. He specifically stated that it is not proved from the documentary evidence on record that the applicant was employed on 29-3-90 at Barula branch on daily wages. Only it has come in the affidavit of applicant Shri Jagjiwan Lal Patel WW-1 that he was appointed at Barula branch for a period from 29-3-90 to 7-12-93 and he worked there continuously for about 1346 days. There is no doubt that

during the course of cross-examination, this witness deposed that he was temporarily appointed and payment was made to him once in a month based on daily wages. This is the oral testimony of the witness. The documentary evidence contained in the 'copy of memorandum (letter of appointment) Exhibit M-1 overrides the above oral testimony. It is clearly mentioned therein that the applicant was appointed as a temporary messenger at Barula Branch office for a period from 29-3-90 to ending on 4-5-90 on monthly salary of Rs. 430 + allowance. This clearly means that the applicant was posted temporarily as messenger on a fixed monthly salary + allowance and was not posted as daily wage. The learned counsel for the workman submitted that the above evidence of the applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel WW-1 that he was paid once in a month on the basis of a daily wages has come in his cross-examination due to pressure of cross examination. He further submitted that when there are two contradictory evidence on one point—one oral and the other documentary. In that circumstance, the documentary evidence shall prevail over the oral testimony of the witness. The contention of the learned counsel for the workman is having force. I am also of the considered opinion that in this case it is proved by the documentary evidence that applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel was posted at Barula Branch as temporary messenger on a fixed monthly salary of Rs. 430 + allowance. It is not at all proved that he was posted as a daily wage.

10. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the management that the Branch Manager working in the various branches are not empowered to interview, select and appoint persons as messenger in the Bank. Against it, the learned counsel for the workman submitted that the Branch Manager is empowered to appoint a temporary messenger in the Bank. There is photocopy of Bi-partite Agreement dated 27-10-88 and 9-1-99 on record filed by the management. It is marked Exhibit M-II. A copy of Annexure VI thereto (circular No. 5 of 1986) is a part of the aforesaid Bipartite Agreement. The following is mentioned in clause IV of this annexure.

"If prior reference for making temporary appointment is not possible due to justifiable/compelling circumstances, each case of temporary appointment should be referred in writing by the Branch Manager to his Controlling Authority for post facts approval."

It is clear from the above that in compelling circumstances, the Branch Manager of the Branch of the Bank is duly authorized to make temporary appointment. Therefore the contention of the learned counsel for the management that the Branch Managers working in the various branches are not empowered to make temporary appointments as messenger in the Bank has no force.

11. It is admitted fact between the parties that applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel was appointed as temporary messenger at Barula Branch of the management for a period from 29-3-90 to 7-12-93 and

thus according to the oral unrebutted testimony of applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel WW-1 in his affidavit clearly proves that he worked at Barula Branch of the management in the years 1990 to 1993 for about 1346 days. Thus it is proved that the workman continuously without any break worked for more than 240 days at Barula Branch of the management. Therefore it was mandatory on the part of management to issue one month's notice in writing to workman Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel indicating reasons for his retrenchment or he had been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of notice. It was also mandatory on the part of the management to pay him retrenchment compensation. But the record reveals that the services of the applicant was discontinued w.e.f. 8-12-93 without any reason or without showing any cause. No chargesheet was issued to him for misconduct and no departmental enquiry was conducted against him.

12. It is also an admitted fact between the parties that applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel was called for interview on 25-2-97 for the permanent post of part time messenger and was selected for the said post. The document marked Exhibit M-3 is the Photostat copy of the appointment letter which reveals that on the basis of interview, Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel was selected for appointment on the permanent post of part-time messenger at Hirmi Branch of the management and he was intimated to contact the Branch Manager, Hirmi Branch with the original certificates and true copies thereof mentioned in the said document. The case of the workman is that though he was selected for the said post but was not given any appointment order till date and the management is forcing him to withdraw the present reference case so that he may not claim his reinstatement with back wages. It has also been averred in the statement of claim of the workman that the above act of the management clearly shows their malafide intentions and the act of management of terminating his services is malafide, capricious, against the principles of natural justice and *void-ab-initio*. It has been clearly denied by the management in their written statement that the applicant was asked to withdraw the reference. It is pleaded therein that a permanent part-time employee appointment by order dated 31-7-97 was offered to the applicant and he was directed to report for duty on 15-8-97 at Hirmi Branch of State Bank of India but he did not report. It has come in the affidavit of applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel WW-1 that the management was forcing him to withdraw the case and he was forced not to claim reinstatement and back wages. In the affidavit of Shri V. K. Shah, MW-I it has been stated on oath that the applicant was directed for report of duty on 15-8-97 at Hirmi Branch of the State Bank of India but he voluntarily did not avail the benefit of appointment order and thus waived all his claims. It has also come in the affidavit of the above witness that the Branch Manager of Branch Hirmi asked the applicant to fulfill the necessary formalities inter alia including the declaration as required under the rules of the Bank. This witness during cross-examination

deposed that he has no knowledge that the Branch Manager asked the applicant to withdraw this reference case before issuing appointment order to him. Thus this witness of the management is ignorant of the fact if the applicant was asked to withdraw this reference case for getting appointment order as permanent part time employee. There is a photocopy of the letter dated 12-9-97 addressed to AGM/I/RP/97-98/60. This is the photocopy of a letter (Exhibit M-5) sent by the Branch Manager, Hirmi Branch of the management with reference to the original office letter No. ZO/AGM/I/AJ/1364 dated 26-8-97 on the subject of appointment of part time general attendant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel. It is mentioned in the copy of the said letter that applicant Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel refused to sign on that particular declaration, he told that the issue of his post of temporary service performed by him in various branches is pending in the court of law and as such he shall decide whether to sign on that declaration form or not, only after consulting with his well wishers. In this letter the enclosure is mentioned as "format declaration form annexed on Item-VI". And in this manner, Exhibit M-6 the copy of the declaration form is the part of the aforesaid letter. Para-I of this declaration form clearly indicates that the applicant was made to sign the declaration form that he would not claim any salary and allowances, back wages, leave and medical facilities and other benefits for the temporary service performed by him in the Bank from time to time before appointing him on the permanent basis and keep the same on the service record of the candidate. Thus it is clearly proved that before issuing appointment letter to the applicant for the permanent post of part time employee, he was asked to withdraw this reference case which related to his reinstatement in service on the ground that he has temporarily served the management for more than 240 days, continuously with back wages and other benefits. This act of the management is no doubt malafide.

13. It has been held above that workman Shri Jagjivan Lal Patel had put in 1346 days of continuous service with the management. Therefore it was mandatory on the part of management to issue and serve one month's notice in writing to him indicating the reasons for discontinuation of his service amounting to his retrenchment w.e.f. 8-12-93 or he had been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of notice. It was also mandatory on the part of management to pay him retrenchment compensation. I am of the considered opinion that this discontinuation of service of the workman w.e.f. 8-12-93 amounted to his retrenchment. The record reveals that the management failed to comply with the above mandatory provisions of Section-25(F) of the Act. The action of the management in terminating the service of the workman, is therefore, *void-ab-initio*. Not only the above, the management did not issue appointment order to the workman for the post of permanent part-time employee as he did not yield to the wishes of the management to withdraw this reference case. This act of the management is highly malafide.

14. In view of the above, it is hereby held that the action of the management in terminating the service of the workman is illegal. The said act of the management is *void-ab-initio*. The workman shall be deemed to be in regular service with the management continuously and is entitled to wages and allowances w.e.f. 8-12-93 till date. Considering the facts and circumstances of this reference, I am of the considered opinion that he is also entitled to recover Rs. 2500 as cost from the management.

15. It is therefore concluded from the above that the action of the management of State Bank of India in relation to their branch at Barula in terminating the services of Shri Jagjivanlal Patel, S/o. Shri Anupam Ram Patel, messenger is not justified and therefore he is entitled to be reinstated in service w.e.f. 8-12-93 on the regular post of messenger with all back wages and allowances with cost of Rs. 2500. The reference is answered accordingly in favour of the workman and against the management.

16. In view of my above findings, the action of management of State Bank of India in relation to their branch at Barula terminating the services of Shri Jagjivanlal Patel, S/o. Shri Anupam Patel messenger is quashed and his termination from service is hereby set aside. He shall be deemed to be in service of the management continuously on the regular post of messenger w.e.f. 8-12-93. The management is directed to pay him wages and allowances from 8-12-93 till date. This be done within two months time from the date of publication of this award. If the wages and allowances are not paid in 2 months time, the workman shall be entitled to interest @ 9% per annum on the amount of wages and allowances remained unpaid. The management is further directed to pay Rs. 2500 as cost to the workman. The award is accordingly given in favour of the workman and against the management.

17. Copy of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3669.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कैथोलिक सरीन बैंक लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण ईडुक्की के पंचात (संदर्भ सं. आईडी-1 आफ 2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/143/2002-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3669.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (ID-1 of 2003) of the Industrial Tribunal IDUKKI now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Catholic Syrian Bank Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-12012/143/2002-IR(B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE COURT OF THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, IDUKKI

(Dated, this the 24th day of August, 2005)

Present ;

Shri P. V. Abraham, B.Sc. L.L.B., Industrial
Tribunal

Industrial Dispute No. 1 of 2003

BETWEEN :

The Chairman,
Catholic Syrian Bank Ltd.,
H.O. Thrissur,
Kerala State.

.....Management

AND

Shri P. M. Mathew,
Palakkamattam,
Lakkattoor P.O.,
Kottayam,
Kerala State.

...Workman

Representations :—

1. Shri Zachariah Kozhy B.Sc. B.L.,
Advocate,
Kottayam.

.....For Management

2. Shri P. N. Ashok Babu,
Advocate and Notary,
Kottayam.

.....For Workman

AWARD

The Government of India as per Order dated 27-8-2002 referred this industrial dispute for adjudication initially to the Industrial Tribunal Kollam. As per order dated 3-12-2002 the Government of India, transferred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal.

The issue referred for adjudication is the following :—

“Whether the action of the management of Catholic Syrian Bank Ltd. with Head Office at Thrissur, Kerala in dismissing the services of Shri P.M. Mathew, Clerk/ Cashier of Chenappady Branch with effect from 3-7-2001 is justified ? If not, what relief the ex-workman is entitled ?”

As per preliminary Order dated 27-6-2005 it was held that the domestic enquiry was conducted properly and in compliance with the principles of natural justice and the management has succeeded in proving the misconduct alleged against the workman. The preliminary order mentioned above is extracted here under :—

“PRELIMINARY ORDER

The workman has contended that he had joined the service of the management in the year 1984 as clerk-cum-cashier. While he was working as clerk-cum-cashier in the Chenappady Branch of the management bank, he was served with memo of charges dated 5-9-2000. The allegations levelled against the workman were that he had remained unauthorisedly absent from duty, irregular attendance, will full insubordination and disobedience to the lawful and reasonable orders of the management, gross negligence in performing duties and misbehaviour towards customers. The workman had submitted his reply on 15-9-2000 denying the charges. The workman had stated in the reply that he was a neurological patient and he was suffering from epileptical seizures quite frequently and he had to undergo medical treatment both as inpatient and outpatient and had to rest as advised by his doctors. The workman had sufficient leave in his credit and he had applied for leave for the purpose of his medical treatment. Despite that the management had ordered a domestic enquiry against the workman. The enquiry officer conducted the domestic enquiry without observing the principles of natural justice and without affording fair opportunity to the workman to defend the charges. The enquiry officer was prejudiced and biased and he acted as a tool in the hands of the management and submitted a report as dictated by the management. The enquiry officer found the workman guilty of the charges. The findings of the enquiry officer are not based on the evidence adduced in the enquiry. On getting the enquiry report, the management issued memo dated 16-6-2001 proposing the punishment of dismissal of the workman from service. The workman had submitted an appeal on 12-7-2001 to the appellate authority. However, the appellate authority had confirmed the punishment of dismissal of the workman from the service. According to the workman, the punishment of dismissal awarded to him is too harsh and disproportionate to the misconduct alleged against him. In the circumstance, the workman seeks to pass a preliminary order setting aside the domestic enquiry.

The management has contended that the workman was initially appointed as a trainee clerk-cum-cashier and after undergoing training for one year he was confirmed in the service of the management on 4-1-1985. He was transferred from Chennai to Kumaranalloor branch during 1988 and to Kottayam Vallikkodu, Zonal Office, Kottayam and to Chenappady branch during 1998. While working at Kottayam branch there were complaints against the workman from the branch manager stating that the workman was undergoing treatment for mental disorder and due to his illness he used to become short tempered and used to quarrel with other staff members especially when he meets female employees. He was transferred to Vallikkodu branch and on the request of his father, he was transferred to Kottayam Zonal Office to enable his treatment and also to

have personal attentions. The branch manager of Vallikkodu branch had reported 20% physical disability to the workman. Still he was accommodated at Chenappady branch in Kottayam District. While so working, he was served a show cause notice alleging acts of grave misconduct. The workman had submitted his explanation. Finding the explanation unsatisfactory, the workman was chargesheeted for the following misconducts :—

1. You unauthorisedly remained absent from duty on several days from 6-3-1999 without submitting any information/leave application including the period from 1-7-2000 to 10-7-2000, 13-7-2000, 18-7-2000, 21-7-2000 and from 24-7-2000 to 31-7-2000 giving scant regard to leave rules of the bank including those given in Head Office Circular No. 8/97 dated 8-1-1997.
2. You continued the practice of remaining absent from duty without submitting leave application/information inspite of standing instructions, instructions/memos issued by the branch manager and head office in this regard. You have also adopted the practice of going to the branch late, at your own will at 12 noon, 1.15 P.M., 1.45 P.M. etc. on several days and to leave the branch at 3.45 P.M. in gross violation of head office instructions and against the systems and procedures of the bank.
3. You have instead of showing proper courtesy to customers, behaved indecently and several oral complaints were made against you to the branch manager including a written complaint by Shri Baby Joseph, a customer of the branch, thereby spoiling the image and reputation of the bank among customers and general public.
4. You are a permanent late comer to the branch on several days reporting at 1.45 P.M. including on 3-1-2000, 24-1-2000, 25-1-2000, 7-2-2000, 8-2-2000, 11-2-2000, 22-2-2000, 23-2-2000 etc. and left the branch at 3.45 P.M. on the days you reported for duty disregarding the instruction from the branch manager.
5. You were highly irregular in reporting for duty and also in submitting leave applications for the leave period in gross violation of the leave rules of the bank. A memo was issued to you by the branch manager on 1-12-1999 instructing to submit leave application for the leave availed by you since 6-3-1999 before 14-12-1999 failing which salary would not be disbursed to you, you. Though salary was not disbursed to you you continued the practice of remaining absent from duty without information and non-submission of leave application.
6. You are in the habit of sitting idle in the branch without performing any duty/duties assigned to you by the branch manager."

The workman submitted his explanation dated 15-9-2000 denying the charges alleged against him. While denying the allegations, the workman tried to seek shelter as a neurological patient admitting that he was suffering from epiletical seizures quite frequently. The workman was informed that his explanations were unsatisfactory and a domestic enquiry was ordered. Shri E.C. Emson, Chief Manager (Law) was appointed as enquiry officer and he had conducted the domestic enquiry complying with all the principles of natural justice. The workman was given opportunity to be defended by a practicing advocate as required by him and he was given opportunity to bring his own witnesses. The findings of the enquiry officer were based on the evidence recorded in the enquiry. A copy of the enquiry report was sent to the workman on 17-5-2001 and the workman had submitted his explanation. The workman had appeared for personal hearing on 29-6-2001. Afterwards he was awarded the punishment of dismissal from service. According to the management the punishment of dismissal awarded to the workman is proportionate to the misconduct proved against him. In the circumstance, the management seeks to pass a preliminary order holding that the domestic enquiry was conducted properly and the findings of the enquiry officer are sustainable.

The file containing the enquiry proceedings, documents, statements of witnesses, enquiry report etc. was marked with the consent of the parties as Exhibit M1. On a perusal of Exhibit M1 enquiry file, it can be seen that the workman had fully participated in the domestic enquiry. The enquiry officer had permitted the workman to engage a practicing lawyer to defend him in the enquiry. The advocate appeared in the enquiry on behalf of the workman had cross-examined all the witnesses examined on the side of the management. The workman was examined as a witness in the enquiry. The workman as well as his advocate had signed on all the pages of the enquiry proceedings. The workman has not pointed out any conduct of the enquiry officer which caused prejudice to him. In the circumstances, I hold that the enquiry officer had conducted the domestic enquiry in compliance with the principles of natural justice and properly.

On a perusal of the evidence in the enquiry and the enquiry report, it can be seen that the enquiry officer had properly considered the entire evidence in the enquiry and rightly came to the conclusion that the workman was guilty of all the misconduct alleged against him. There is nothing to suggest that the findings of the enquiry officer are not proper and sustainable. In the circumstance, I hold that the management has succeeded in proving the misconduct alleged against the workman.

The misconduct proved against the workman are that he had unauthorisedly absented from duty on several days from 6-3-1999 without submitting any leave application, he had adopted the practice of reporting for duty late and leaving the branch before the duty time was over, behaved indecently to customers and was in the habit of sitting idle in the branch without performing any duty. There is no doubt that the misconduct proved against the workman is very grave and serious. The management has stated in the written statement that the workman was confirmed as a

clerk/cashier in the service of the management on 4-1-1985 after undergoing training for one year. The management has not raised any allegation that before 1999 there was any difficulty in the behaviour or conduct of the workman. The workman has produced medical certificates in the enquiry to show that he was a neurological patient and was suffering from behavioural disorder, and epileptical seizures and had undergone treatment both as inpatient and outpatient. Taking into account the totality of the circumstances it has to be presumed that the misbehaviour on the part of the workman was due to his illness. The workman who was examined as WW1 has produced exhibit W1 medical certificate issued by Dr. Mathew-Abraham M.D. (Gen. Med) DM (Neuro). The medical certificate is extracted hereunder :— "This is to certify that Mr. Mathew has been under my treatment for complex partial seizures with a frontal lesion. The fits are now under control on medication. He is fit to resume duty that is in keeping with his physical capabilities." The workman has stated in his evidence that at present he is capable of carrying out his duties properly and he has no other income to look after his aged mother and unmarried sister. In the circumstance, in the interest of justice it is desirable to give one more opportunity to the workman to work and earn salary without giving any room for any complaint. However, the management cannot be put to hardship and difficulties while giving the workman another opportunity to work under the management. Therefore, the following conditions are also incorporated in ordering the reinstatement of the workman in service. The workman is directed to be reinstated in service under the management without any back wages or any other benefits, initially on probation for a period of 3 months which can be extended if, his service is found to be satisfactory. In case the workman causes any inconvenience or difficulties in the functioning of the bank his service can be terminated as if the workman on probation. After the period of probation mentioned above and after the extended period of probation if any if the services and performances of the workman are found to be satisfactory and suitable, his service shall be treated as continuous for the purpose of his increments and other service benefits.

P.V. ABRAHAM, Industrial Tribunal

Appendix

Witness examined on the side of the Management :

NIL

Witness examined on the side of the workman :—

WW1 : Shri P.M. Mathew, the concerned workman.

WW2 : Smt. Celine Mathew Palackamattam, Lakkattoor, Kottayam.

Documents marked on the side of the Management :—

Exhibit M1 : The file containing the enquiry proceedings, documents, statements of witnesses, enquiry report etc.

Documents marked on the side of the Workman :—

Exhibit W1 : Medical certificate dated 11-3-2004 issued by Dr. Mathew Abraham.

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

क्र. अ. 3670.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जयपुर नागौर आंचलिक ग्रामीण बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्राम न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. सीजीआईटी-40/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/66/2004-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3670.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (CGIT-40/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jaipur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the Management of Jaipur Nagaur Aanchlik Gramin Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-9-2005.

[No. L-12012/66/2004-IR(B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT-40/2004

Reference No. L-12012/66/2004 (IR-B-1)

The Secretary,
Gramin Bank Employees Union,
Unit Jaipur Nagaur Aanchlik Gramin Bank,
59, Patel Colony, Sardar Patel Marg,
C-Scheme, Jaipur ... Applicant Union

Versus

The Chairman,
Jaipur Nagaur Aanchlik Gramin Bank,
56, Patel Colony, Sardar Patel Marg,
C-Scheme, Jaipur Non-Applciant

PRESENT:

Presiding Officer : Sh. R.C. Sharma
For the applicant : R. C. Jain
For the non-applicant : Sh. R.K. Kala &
Sh. R.C. Papriwal

Date of Award : 05-8-2005

Award

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 'D' of sub-sections 1 & 2(A) to Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') has referred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

"Whether the action of the management order dated 10-12-01 of Jaipur Nagaur Aanchlik Gramin Bank,

Jaipur in awarding the penalty or reduction of basic pay to the minimum stage in the pay scale of Sh. Chandrabhan Khatik is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The applicant-union has pleaded in its claim statement that its member Sh. Chandrabhan Khatik, the workman, is working as a clerk in the non-applicant bank, who was chargesheeted on 17-12-92. Assailing the domestic enquiry as well as the impugned punishment order, the Union has stated that the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman is unfair and illegal, that there is no mention of the rules under which the workman was chargesheeted, that the Enquiry Officer was not the senior officer to the Presenting Officer and other management witnesses, that no material evidence could be led against the workman and in the absence of the evidence the charges have been found to be proved against the workman. It has been further alleged that the documents have not been exhibited during the course of the enquiry, that the findings of the Enquiry Officer and the disciplinary authority are perverse, that in the similar matter the workman was acquitted by the criminal court and that the punishment inflicted on the workman is not covered by the rules applicable to the employees. The Union has urged that the punishment order dated 10-12-2001 be set aside and it may further be declared that the workman is entitled to get all the consequential benefits on account of setting aside the impugned punishment order.

3. Disputing the claim, the non-applicant in his written-counter has averred that the domestic enquiry was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice, that the workman-delinquent was provided full opportunity by the Enquiry Officer to present his case and to defend himself, that all the documents were made available to the workman and that the punishment order was passed by the disciplinary authority after considering all the relevant material and record of the enquiry. The non-applicant has further supported the findings of the Enquiry Officer by stating that the charges are found proved against the workman and that the employees of the non-applicant bank are governed by the Jaipur Nagaur Aanchlik Gramin Bank Staff Service Regulations. The non-applicant has stated that the judgment of the criminal court is not a bar on the initiation of the disciplinary proceedings.

4. I have heard both the parties and have scanned the enquiry record.

5. The chargesheet dated 17-12-92 levels two charges against the workman which reads as below :—

1. (a) You have failed to maintain honesty, integrity and good faith in following deposit/loan accounts in which you have received the money from account holders and issued counter-foils/receipts in token of receipt of money, but did not deposit in the bank.

The charge contains the details of the accounts wherein the workman had deliberately not deposited the amount and pocketed the amount.

- (b) You have also made false entries in above respective ledgers accounts, but the same was not entered in any other subsidiary books of the Bank.

2. You have received the money from the following account holders and issued the counter-foils/receipts in token of receipt of money but did not deposit in the Bank and pocketed the same. You have also not entered the amount in any book of the bank (details of the account as well as amount are given in the chargesheet).

The bank, thus, charges you for

1. Misappropriation and embezzlement of Bank's funds, and
2. Doing acts detrimental to the interest of the Bank.

Objection No. 1

6. The Ld. representative for the workman has contended that the documents were exhibited without examining the witnesses and the copies thereof were not given to the delinquent. Countering this submission, the Ld. representative for the non-applicant contends that the documents were exhibited by the management witnesses and when the documents were presented by the presenting officer on 10-12-97, the copies thereof were handed over to the delinquent on the same date.

7. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions.

8. On perusal of the ordersheet dated 10-12-97, it is reflected that the presenting officer had submitted the list of the witnesses along with the documents on the day, which were also furnished to the defence nominee. The Ld. representative for the workman in the rejoinder has stated that only the copy of the list of the documents was supplied to the workman and not the copies of the documents. But this submission is not supported from the record on the count that subsequent to the proceedings dated 10-12-97, nowhere the workman could raise an objection as to the non-supply of documents relied upon by the management. Secondly, the similar note has been recorded by the Enquiry Officer on 10-12-98 when the delinquent had presented the documents along with the list of witnesses in support of his case and the copies thereof were handed over to the presenting officer. As such, this submission of the workman is not fortified from the record that the copies of the documents were not furnished to him.

9. Similarly, the objection raised to the exhibiting of documents is also untenable as on perusal of the testimony of management witnesses, it appears that they have exhibited the material documents in their depositions during the course of the enquiry. Apart from this, in view of the principle propounded by the Hon'ble apex Court in 1997 (1) L.J. SC 754, the rules of evidence are not strictly applicable to the enquiry proceedings. Hence, the submission advanced on behalf of the workman is devoid of any merit and cannot be accepted. The Ld. representative for the workman has also referred to the following decisions in support of his

submission which are of no avail to him in view of the aforesaid factual as well as legal position : 1998 (78) FLR SC 700; 1981 WLC (UC) Raj. 45; AIR 1986 2118; 2000 (3) WLC Raj. 529; 1998 (11) LLJ 799 SC.

Objection No. II

10. The Id. representative for the workman has submitted that the Enquiry Officer has suo moto directed the Presenting Officer to re-examine MW-1, MW-2 and MW-3 and thereafter no direction was given to the delinquent to further cross-examine them. On the other hand, the Id. representative for the non-applicant contends that the presenting officer had sought the permission to cross-examine these witnesses which was not objected by the delinquent and after the re-examination, the delinquent had not sought the permission to further cross-examine the witnesses.

11. On perusal of the record, it appears that on closure of the cross-examinations of MW-1, Mahesh Kumar Atal, MW-2, JP Bairwa & MW-3, JP Meena, the Enquiry Officer has asked the presenting officer that if he wishes to re-examine these witnesses he can put the questions to them. The presenting officer wanted to put questions to the witnesses in the re-examination, who was permitted and he put two questions to MW-3, JP Meena and few more questions to MW-1, MK Atal and MW-2, JP Bairwa, which appear to be of clarificatory nature. Furthermore, it is reflected from the depositions of these witnesses that after conducting their re-examination, the delinquent had not sought any opportunity to further cross-examine them. As such, the submission set forth on behalf of the workman that the re-examination of the witnesses has prejudiced his case cannot be maintained.

Objection No. III

12. The Id. representative for the workman then has contended that makers of the complaint Ex. M-8 Sheopal Singh, M-44 Tisa Devi, M-47 Gopal Singh and M-13 Ramesh Dhanuka, were not examined by the management and these complaints have been relied upon by the Enquiry Officer. The Id. representative for the workman has placed his reliance upon 1998 (78) FLR SC 700; 1981 WLC (UC) Raj. 457; 1999 (81) FLR SC 730 & 2000 (LLJ) SC 495. On the other hand, the Id. representative for the non-applicant has sought to meet out the submission by contending that it is not necessary to call the makers of the complaints in the evidence. The Id. representative has also contended that the delinquent had deposited the money in question through the vouchers Ex. M-61 to M-63 meaning thereby he had admitted his guilt and he had also admitted in the application Ex. M-60. In the rejoinder, the Id. representative for the workman submits that the letter dates to the date 20-8-92 whereas the workman was charged on 17-12-92, that his explanation was not accepted and the enquiry was initiated against him. He has further contended that this plea has not been taken in the reply and the workman has been taken at surprise, who got no opportunity to explain it.

13. It is alleged that the delinquent had received the amount from Sheopal Singh, Tisa Devi, Gopal Singh and Ramesh Dhanuka, the account-holders and he signed on

the instrument of the receipt of the amount, but pocketed the money instead of depositing them. The Enquiry Officer in his report has relied upon the testimony of MW-1, MK Atal, the Branch Manager who has deposed these facts in his testimony and has verified the signatures of the delinquent on the instruments of receiving the amount. Apart it, the Enquiry Officer has also relied upon the submission of the delinquent put forth in his written briefs that a conspiracy was hatched against him by the two officers of the bank and they got the vouchers signed from him.

14. Ex. M-60 dated 20-8-92 is a letter which has been stated to have been written by the delinquent and was adduced during the course of enquiry. MW-3, JP Meena has proved it, wherein the workman says that he had kept the amount with him received from Shedu Ram Khatik, Nathu Lal Sharma, Smt. Tisa Devi and Sheopal Singh. He further states that out of this amount Rs. 1100/- he is depositing today and rest of the amount he will also deposit and no such mistake will be committed by him in future. MW-3, JP Meena has also exhibited the vouchers Ex. M-61 to Ex. M-63 through which the amount in question was deposited by the delinquent. This witness offered himself for the cross-examination also. Therefore, this documentary evidence was adduced even before the Enquiry Officer and the delinquent had every opportunity to question its genuineness. It, therefore, flows that admittedly the amount from these account holders was received by the delinquent, pocketed by him for sometime and therefore deposited into their accounts. Under these circumstances, the non-examination of the makers of the complaint has not prejudiced the workman's case and the contention raised by the Id. representative for the non-applicant finds support from the record. The Enquiry Officer has placed his reliance on the documents which have been exhibited by the relevant and material witnesses and the non-examination of these persons has not adversely affected the conclusion of the guilt drawn by the Enquiry Officer. On these facts, the decisions referred to on behalf of the Id. representative for the workman has no application to the present controversy and his submission is negated.

Objection No. IV

15. The Id. representative for the workman then has contended that the Enquiry Officer, witnesses and the presenting officer are of the same cadre, whereas the Enquiry Officer ought to have been higher than the witnesses. The Id. representative further adds that the Enquiry Officer Sh. Kamlesh Kumar Mathur, the presenting officer Sh. VS Chauhan and the management witnesses Sh. Mahesh Kumar Atal, JP Bairwa and JP Meena are all officers, which vitiates the enquiry.

16. Contrary to it, the Id. representative for the non-applicant has sought to controvert the submission by stating that the Enquiry Officer was the officer in scale 1, who was senior to all such officers. The Id. representative further contends that in view of the Regulation 30(3), the Enquiry Officer should be the senior to the officer charged.

17. The enquiry was conducted under the Staff Service Regulations and its Regulation 30(3) envisages

that the enquiry under the regulation and the procedure with the exception of the final order, may be delegated in case the person against whom proceedings are taken is an officer to *(any officer senior to such officer) and in the case of an employee to any officer. For purposes of the inquiry, the officer or employee may not engage a legal practitioner". It no where requires that the Enquiry Officer should be senior to the witnesses also.

18. Suffice it to state that in the case on hand, the delinquent was a clerk whereas Enquiry Officer was an officer, senior to him. As such, the submission advanced on behalf of the workman being inconsistent to the regulation cannot be accepted and is repelled accordingly.

Objection No. V

19. Lastly, the Id. representative for the workman contends that the punishments inflicted on the workman is contrary to rules as there is no provision of reduction of basic pay to the minimum stage in the rule 30(1)(c), according to which the pay can be reduced up to one lower stage only and on this ground, the impugned punishment order deserves to be set aside. Controverting this submission, the Id. representative for the non-applicant contends that the impugned punishment can be inflicted on the workman since "a" lower stage does not mean that it should only be "one" stage lower. The Id. representative further adds that it is within the province of the Disciplinary Authority to decide as to what penalty should be imposed.

20. The disciplinary authority vide order dated 10-12-2001 has imposed the impugned penalty on the delinquent under Rule 30(1) of Jaipur Nagaur Aanchalik Gramin Bank Staff Service Regulations, 1981 as follows. "His basic pay is reduced to the minimum stage in his pay scale with immediate effect".

21. Regulation 30(1)(C) is reproduced as under :—

"Degradation to a lower post or grade or to a lower stage in his incremental scale".

22. The contention put forth on behalf of the workman is that the penalty of reduction of basic pay to the minimum stage is not permissible in view of this regulation which says that the basic pay could be lowered down up to one lower stage only and not to its minimum. The Id. representative in support of his submission has relied upon 2004 (1) WLC Raj. 753; 1998 (2) WLC 647 Raj.; 1999 (II) LLJSC 514 AND 1981 (2) SLR Calcutta 33.

23. The later two judicial verdicts are rendered on different facts. I will advert to the principle propounded by the Hon'ble Rajasthan High Court in 1998 (2) WLC 647 Raj. and 2004 (1) WLC Raj. 753. 1998 (2) WLC 647 Raj. the Hon'ble High Court has held that withholding of increments with cumulative effect and withholding of increments without cumulative effect is not the same thing. Apparently, such a question is not involved in the present controversy.

24. But in 2004 (1) WLC Raj. 753, a similar question came up before His Lordship and it was contended on behalf of the petitioner that the connected regulation 4(e)

do not permit reduction to more than one stage in the time scale, had the intention of the Regulations Making Authority been to reduce the pay to more than one stage, it could not have prefixed "a" to a lower stage. It was further contended that "A" is an article which connects "one" and not many. His Lordship on this question has observed as below :—

"In my considered opinion as per the provisions of regulation 4(e) reduction to a lower stage means reduction to the lower stage from the stage the petitioner at relevant point of time was working not on the lowest grade. The judgment referred by the respondents is not applicable to the instant case as the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Kulwant Singh held withholding of 2 increments valid. This is a lower stage in time scale not a lowest."

25. The Hon'ble Court has further stated that "in view of this fact, the penalty imposed by the disciplinary authority and upheld by the appellate authority to fix the petitioner in lower stage is herewith modified to lower stage instead of lowest stage".

26. The facts of the referred to decision on behalf of the delinquent are squarely applicable to the present controversy and the letter "a" occurring in Regulation 30(1)(c) cannot be stretched to mean the reduction of basic pay to minimum stage, which is not permissible in view of this clause.

27. Applying the principle propounded by the Hon'ble Rajasthan High Court, the impugned punishment can be modified to the extent of reduction of basic pay to a stage in the pay scale of Chandrabhan Khatik.

28. The Id. representative for the non-applicant has also drawn my attention towards the various rulings (1997) 4 SCC 565; 203; LLR SC R436; 1991 (1) WLC Raj. 102; 2002 (7) SLR Punjab & Haryana 221, which I have carefully gone through, but they do not bear the resemblance with the facts of the instant controversy and are of no avail to the non-applicant.

29. For the foregoing reasons, the contentions raised on behalf of the workman except No. V are bereft of substance and are repelled. Contention No. V is accepted as discussed therein.

30. Consequently, the reference is answered to this effect that the order dated 10-12-2001 passed by the management of the non-applicant in awarding the penalty of reduction of basic pay to the minimum stage in the pay-scale of the workman is modified to a lower stage instead of the minimum stage. The claim of the workman is partly allowed in this manner and an award is passed in these terms accordingly.

31. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(a) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3671.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार वेस्टर्न रेलवे के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-27/2005) को प्रकृति करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-41012/143/2004-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3671.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (CGIT No. -27/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Western Railway and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-9-2005.

[No. L-41012/143/2004-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT/27 2005

Reference No. L-41012/143/2004-IR(B-1)

Sh. Amar Singh,
S/o Sh. Devi Ram,
R/o Village-Varoda, Tehsil-Bayana,
Distt. Bharatpur ...Applicant

Versus

1. The Assistant Engineer,
Western Railway,
Bharatpur
2. The Divisional Railway Manager,
Western Railway,
Kota (Rajasthan) ...Non-applicants

Present :

Presiding Officer : Sh. R.C. Sharma,
For the applicant : Sh. Pratap Singh Chaudhary
For the non-applicants : Sh. Balvinder Singh,
Date of award : 18-8-2005

AWARD

The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 'D' of Sub-sections 1 & 2(A) to Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') has referred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Divisional Railway Manager, Western Railway, Kota in terminating the services of workman Sh. Amar Singh, S/o Sh. Devi Ram w.e.f. 8-5-2002 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The workman has pleaded in its claim statement that he was regularly appointed as a Gangman on 5-3-83, who was subsequently transferred to several places and on 20-12-2000, he was transferred from unit No. 1 at Sevar to the unit No. 3 at Jagheena. He challenged the transfer order before the Central Administrative Tribunal and kept himself regularly attending the duty at Jagheena. He was also granted the leave, but he was marked absent by the authorities during his leave period and was transferred therefrom. He challenged the transfer order before the Central Administrative Tribunal, which directed the non-applicants to consider on his representation, which was not considered and on 3-11-2003, when he appeared before the non-applicant No. 1, he was orally intimated that his service was terminated on 8-5-2002. He unsuccessfully raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), who submitted the failure report to the competent Government. The workman has assailed the termination order dated 8-5-2002 alleging it to be illegal and that no enquiry, was conducted against him. He has urged that he be reinstated in the service with all consequential benefits.

3. The non-applicants in their written counter disputing the claim of the workman have averred that on complaint, the workman was transferred and they have supported the termination order passed against the workman.

4. After hearing both the parties on the preliminary issue of fairness of domestic enquiry, this Court vide its order dated 11-8-2005 has found the domestic enquiry to be fair and proper.

5. I have heard both the parties and have scanned the record.

6. The Ld. representative for the workman contends that two charges were levelled against the workman but the complainants did not appear before the Enquiry Officer nor their complaints were submitted before him and the conclusion drawn by the Enquiry Officer is totally perverse. He has next contended that without examining both the complainants the Enquiry Officer has found the charges proved against the delinquent and that there is no documentary proof against the workman to prove the charges levelled against him.

7. Countering these submissions, the Ld. representative for the non-applicants submit that the enquiry was not required to be initiated against the workman, who was chargesheeted on account of his misbehaviour with his senior officers and the charges have been found to be proved against him by the Enquiry Officer.

8. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions.

9. The chargesheet dated 8-3-2001 levels two charges against the workman which read (i) that while you were working on 8-12-2000 in the capacity of Gangman in unit No. 81 under Senior Divisional Engineer at Sevar station, Sh. Roop Singh Meena, Junior Engineer inspected the work done by your gang, then you asked him that who are you to inspect and you misbehaved with him and obstructed the railway work.

(ii) That on 9-12-2000 you were given a particular task by Sh. Shailendra Singh, which you refused to complete and when you were reminded you misbehaved with him and threatened to commit suicide. Thus, you did not do the railway work and put hindrance in the security of railway work and you committed the misconduct by defying the orders of the superior officers.

10. It is clear that the enquiry proceedings were conducted ex parte against the workman, who despite the proper service of the notices did not put his appearance before the Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer in his report dated 31-10-2001 has recorded that notices were issued to the delinquent employee at his residential address and it is reported to him that the delinquent came in the office on 17-10-2001 and refused to receive the notice by stating that it was received by him through the registered post, whereas the registered postal cover has been returned, which proves that the workman is not deliberately participating in the enquiry proceedings and admits his guilt. After noting this observation, the Enquiry Officer has concluded that the delinquent is found to be guilty for defying the official orders and obstructing the official work.

11. The enquiry report was then submitted to the disciplinary authority who agreed to it on the same grounds and has imposed the punishment of termination on the delinquent vide his order dated 8-5-2002. It flows from the aforesaid facts that the Enquiry Officer has not recorded the testimony of any witness and even the complainants Roop Singh Meena and Shailendra Singh were not examined by the management during the course of the enquiry to prove the misconduct levelled against the delinquent. There is no evidence available on the record to connect the delinquent with his guilt and it appears that without recording the statements of witnesses and even without exhibiting the documents, the Enquiry Officer has recorded his finding of guilt against the workman. Thus, clearly it is case of no evidence and no reasonable person could have arrived at the finding of guilt against the delinquent on these facts. The submission advanced on behalf of the workman is supported by the decision reported in 2004 Lab IC Bombay 972, wherein the Hon'ble Court has observed that the enquiry report must disclose the analysis of the evidence in relation to the allegations of misconduct against the delinquent. As such, the management has failed to justify the impugned termination order passed against the workman.

12. The Ld. representative for the non-applicants has contended that no enquiry was required to be conducted in the case. But the Ld. representative has failed to show any relevant provision under the rules or the Bipartite Settlement which envisages that on such allegation/misconduct levelled against the employee, the enquiry proceedings are not required to be initiated against him. As such, there is no force in the submission put forward on behalf of the management, which is unsustainable.

13. For the foregoing reasons, the impugned termination order passed against the workman cannot be maintained and the claim of the workman deserves to be allowed.

14. In consequence, the reference is answered in the affirmative in favour of the workman and against the non-applicants and it is held that the termination order dated 8-5-2002 passed against the workman is illegal and unjustified. The workman is entitled to be reinstated in the service with its continuity and 25 per cent back-wages. An award is passed in these terms accordingly.

15. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3672.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आई.एफ.सी.आई. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 57/2001) को प्रकशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/78/2001—आई आर (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3672.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. No. 57/2001 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi No. 1 as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of I.F.C.I. and their workman, received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-12011/78/2001-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
NEW DELHI

Presiding Officer : SHRI S. S. BAL

I.D. No. 57/2001

In the matter of dispute between :

The General Secretary,
All India I.F.C.I. Employees Asson.,
I.F.C.I. Tower,
61, Nehru Place,
New Delhi-110019

.....Workman

Versus

The General Manager,
I.F.C.I. Ltd., I.F.C.I. Tower,
61, Nehru Place,
New Delhi-110019

.....Management

APPEARANCES:

Sh. Madan Lal General Secretary,
All India I.F.C.I. Employees Asson.,
Sh. M. Bhaskaran, Manager I.F.C.I. Ltd.,
for management

AWARD.

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12011/78/2001-IR (B-II) dated 7/14-09-2001 has referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of Management of Industrial Finance Corporation of India Ltd. to carry out amendment unilaterally to the Staff Quarters Allotment Rules vide H.R. Circular No. 2/2000 dated 12-1-2000 and No. 13/96 dated 14-5-96 is justified? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to?”

2. Brief facts of this case as culled from record are that some amendments of the staff quarters allotment rules were effected vide Circular No. 13/96 dated 14th May, 1996 vide which H.R. Circular No. 2/2000 dated 12-1-2000 was superseded by the management by effecting amendment. The worker's Association petitioner A.I.E.C.I. Employees Association challenged and disputed the said circulars which culminated in the reference. After notice parties appeared and workers Association filed statement of claim impugning the amendments brought about in the accommodations Staff Quarters Allotment Rules and claimed the said amendments be repealed/annulled. The management disputed the claim by filing reply and justified the amendments. Thereafter both the parties sought time and ultimately arrived at a concencious amicable settlement based on mutual concencious and the amendments were superseded and the impugned Circulars No. 13/96 dated 14-5-96 and H.R. Circular No. 2/2000 dated 12th June, 2000 were superseded and rules were amended vide Ex. R1 which is part of the settlement. Shri Madan Lal, General Secretary on behalf of the workman association and Shri M. Bhaskaran Manager. The respondent stated that the contentions issues between the parties with regard to in respect of the dispute have been amicably settled and therefore, no dispute exists between them at present regarding staff quarters accommodation rules. In view of their statement and Circular No. 21/2005 dt. 13th July, 2005 Ex. R-1 a 'No Dispute Award' is passed between the parties. File be consigned to record room.

S.S. BAL, Presiding Officer

Dated 02-09-2005

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3673. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 67/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/293/2000-आई आर (बी-II)]

सी गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3673.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. 67/2001 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Bank of India and their workman, received by the Central Government on 14-09-2005.

[No. L-12011/293/2000-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**LOK ADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005—THE SUNDAY
THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR**

NO. CGIT/LC/R/67/2001

Presiding Officer : SHRI C.M. SINGH

The General Secretary,
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,
Hardev Niwas, 9, Sanwer Road,
Ujjain.

..... Workman/Union

Versus

The Manager,
Bank of India,
Freeganj, Ujjain (MP)

..... Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 1. | Shri C.M. Singh, Presiding Officer,
CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. | Shri R.C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. | Shri Ashish Agrawal,
Advocate | Member |

AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of September, 2005

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12011/293/2000-IR (B-II) dated 28-3-2001 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of India, Regional Office, Ujjain in terminating the services of Shri Ajay Kumar Jain w.e.f. 14-11-1997 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. The reference is taken up in Lok Adalat today. On behalf of the management, an application has been moved with the prayer that the award be passed in terms of settlement in the interest of justice. Workman Shri Ajay Kumar Jain and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi, General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain also submitted that the matter has been compromised between both the parties regarding which the parties have filed memorandum of settlement today. Shri A.K. Shashi, Advocate for the management and workman Shri Ajay Kumar Jain and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi named above submitted that the award be passed in terms of memorandum of settlement. The following are the terms of settlement :—

1. "The request to appoint Shri Ajay Kumar Jain, the workman in regular Sub Staff cadre is hereby accepted by the Bank Management as a gesture of goodwill. He will be appointed full time 'Safai Karamchari cum Hammal' in regular pay scale at first stage, as applicable in the Bank provided he is not found medically unfit for the said post by the Bank's Doctor. The appointment shall be with prospective effect and in any of the offices/branches of the Bank under Ujjain Zone at the sole discretion of the Bank Management subject to the Union/workman fulfilling obligations on their part as mentioned here-in-after, in full and final satisfaction of all the claims of the workman against the Bank up to this date.
2. The Union/workman, shall forthwith withdraw all the cases filed by them against the Bank before any forum including cases that are pending before Labour Enforcement Officer, Indore, Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and Conciliation Officer, Bhopal, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur, Authority under Payment of Gratuity Act (which is now pending in High Court, Jabalpur) etc. in relation to claimant's claims for past service, back wages etc.
3. The Union/workman further undertakes and declares that the workman shall discharge his duties sincerely, faithfully and with devotion as he is expected of the employees of sub staff cadre and shall not raise any dispute/claims whatsoever pertaining to any matter prior to this date against the Bank Management.
4. The workman herein shall not be entitled to any seniority, back wages, gratuity or bonus or any other past service benefits etc. and he will be governed by the service conditions as are prevalent in the Bank and as may be modified from time to time.
5. The workman when offered appointment and posted as aforesaid shall report for duties within 7 days from receipt of the offer otherwise it shall be construed that the workman has given up all his claims against the Bank and the offer shall stand as withdrawn automatically.
6. In case the workman is employed elsewhere he will have to produce a proper discharge/relieving letter from the existing employer prior to joining Bank's services.
7. The workman shall submit Bio-data in Bank's format and certificates for educational qualification, proof of age, caste (if applicable) etc. as per Bank's rules within 5 days from today.
8. Both the parties hereby agree to file a copy of this settlement before the CGIT Jabalpur in case No. CGIT/LC/67/01 within 10 days from today with the request to pass the Award in terms of this settlement. Both the parties will jointly file

copy of this settlement before the Hon'ble High Court, Jabalpur with the prayer that by virtue of this settlement the grievances stand resolved.

9. This settlement will not be cited as a precedent in any of the proceedings before any authority.
10. Both the parties shall submit implementation report within one month to RLC (C), Bhopal otherwise, it will be presumed that the settlement is fully implemented."

3. I have very carefully gone through the above mentioned terms of settlement. They are just and fair. Therefore on the basis of compromise reached between the parties, the award is passed in accordance with the terms of settlement mentioned above without any order as to costs.

4. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का.आ. 3674.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 30/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/238/2000-आई आर (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3674.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 30/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure. in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 14-09-2005.

[No. L-12011/238/2000-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

LOK ADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005—THE SUNDAY

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/30/2001

Presiding Officer : SHRI C.M. SINGH

The General Secretary,
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,
Hardev Niwas, 9, Sanwer Road,
Ujjain.

..... Workman/Union

Versus

The Manager,
Bank of India,
Freeganj, Ujjain (MP)

.....Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 1. | Shri C.M. Singh, Presiding Officer,
CGIT Cum Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. | Shri R.C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. | Shri Ashish Agrawal,
Advocate | Member |

AWARD**Passed on this 4th day of September, 2005**

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour *vide* its Notification No. L-12011/238/2000-IR (B-II) dated 16-1-2001 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the Bank of India in terminating the service of Shri Rishipal Marmat w.e.f. March 1998 and not regularising him in banks service is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. The reference is taken up in Lok Adalat today. On behalf of the management, an application has been moved with the prayer that the award be passed in terms of settlement in the interest of justice. Workman Shri Rampal Marmat and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi, General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain also submitted that the matter has been compromised between both the parties regarding which the parties have filed memorandum of settlement today. Shri A.K. Shashi, Advocate for the management and workman Shri Rishipal Marmat and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi named above submitted that the award be passed in terms of memorandum of settlement. The following are the terms of settlement :—

1. “The request to appoint Shri Marmat, the workman in regular Sub Staff cadre is hereby accepted by the Bank Management as a gesture of goodwill. He will be appointed full time ‘Safai Karamchhari cum Hammal’ in regular pay scale at first stage, as applicable in the Bank provided he is not found medically unfit for the said post by the Bank’s Doctor. The appointment shall be with prospective effect and in any of the offices/branches of the Bank under Ujjain Zone at the sole discretion of the Bank Management subject to the Union/workman fulfilling obligations on their part as mentioned here-in-after, in full and final satisfaction of all the claims of the workman against the Bank up to this date.
2. The Union/workman, shall forthwith withdraw all the cases filed by them against the Bank before any forum including cases that are pending before Labour Enforcement Officer,

Indore, Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and Conciliation Officer, Bhopal, Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court, Jabalpur, Authority under Payment of Gratuity Act (which is now pending in High Court, Jabalpur) etc. in relation to claimant’s claims for past service, back wages etc.

3. The Union/workman further undertakes and declares that the workman shall discharge his duties sincerely, faithfully and with devotion as he is expected of the employees of sub staff cadre and shall not raise any dispute/claims whatsoever pertaining to any matter prior to this date against the Bank Management.
4. The workman herein shall not be entitled to any seniority, back wages, gratuity or bonus or any other past service benefits etc. and he will be governed by the service conditions as are prevalent in the Bank and as may be modified from time to time.
5. The workman when offered appointment and posted as aforesaid shall report for duties within 7 days from receipt of the offer otherwise it shall be construed that the workman has given up all his claims against the Bank and the offer shall stand as withdrawn automatically.
6. In case the workman is employed elsewhere he will have to produce a proper discharge/relieving letter from the existing employer prior to joining Bank’s services.
7. The workman shall submit Bio-data in Bank’s format and certificates for educational qualification, proof of age, caste (if applicable) etc. as per Bank’s rules within 5 days from today.
8. Both the parties hereby agree to file a copy of this settlement before the CGIT Jabalpur in case No. CGIT/LC/30/01 within 10 days from today with the request to pass the Award in terms of this settlement. Both the parties will jointly file copy of this settlement before the Hon’ble High Court, Jabalpur with the prayer that by virtue of this settlement the grievances stand resolved.
9. This settlement will not be cited as a precedent in any of the proceedings before any authority.
10. Both the parties shall submit implementation report within one month to RLC (C), Bhopal otherwise, it will be presumed that the settlement is fully implemented.”
3. I have very carefully gone through the above mentioned terms of settlement. They are just and fair. Therefore on the basis of compromise reached between the parties, the award is passed in accordance with the terms of settlement mentioned above without any order as to costs.
4. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3675.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 65/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/291/2000-आई आर (बी. II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3675.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 65/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the management of Bank of India, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-12011/291/2000-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

LOK ADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005-THE SUNDAY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/65/2001

Presiding Officer : Shri C.M. Singh

The General Secretary,
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,
Hardev Niwas, 9, Sanwer Road,
Ujjain.

Workman/Union

Versus

The Regional Manager,
Bank of India, Regional Office,
Freenganj, Ujjain. (M.P.)

.....Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Shri C. M. Singh, Presiding Officer,
CGIT Cum Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. Shri R. C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. Shri Ashish Agrawal
Advocate | Member |

AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of September, 2005

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12011/291/2000/IR(B. II) dated 28-3-2001 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :-

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of India, Regional Office, Ujjain in terminating the services of Shri Yashwant Singh Chandel w.e.f. 14-11-1997 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled for?"

2. The reference is taken up in Lok Adalat today. On behalf of the management, an application has been moved with the prayer that the award be passed in terms of settlement in the interest of justice. Workman Shri Yashwant Singh Chandel and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi, General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain also submitted that the matter has been compromised between both the parties regarding which the parties have filed memorandum of settlement today. Shri A.K. Shashi, Advocate for the management and workman Shri Yashwant Singh Chandel and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi named above submitted that the award be passed in terms of memorandum of settlement. The following are the terms of settlement :-

1. "The request to appoint Shri Yashwant Singh Chandel, the workman in regular Sub Staff cadre is hereby accepted by the Bank Management as a gesture of goodwill. He will be appointed full time "Safai Karmchhari cum Hammal" in regular pay scale at first stage, as applicable in the Bank provided he is not found medically unfit for the said post by the Bank's Doctor. The appointment shall be with prospective effect and in any of the offices/branches of the Bank under Ujjain Zone at the sole discretion of the Bank Management subject to the Union/workman fulfilling obligations on their part as mentioned here-in-after, in full and final satisfaction of all the claims of the workman against the Bank up to this date.
2. The Union/workman, shall forthwith withdraw all the cases filed by them against the Bank before any forum including cases that are pending before Labour Enforcement Officer, Indore, Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and Conciliation Officer, Bhopal, Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court, Jabalpur, Authority under Payment of Gratuity Act (which is now pending in High Court, Jabalpur) etc. in relation to claimant's claims for past service, back wages etc.
3. The Union/workman further undertakes and declares that the workman shall discharge his duties sincerely, faithfully and with devotion as he is expected of the employee of sub staff cadre and shall not raise any dispute/claims whatsoever pertaining to any matter prior to this date against the Bank Management.
4. The workman herein shall not be entitled to any seniority, back wages, gratuity or bonus or any other past service benefits etc. and he will be governed by the service conditions as are prevalent in the Bank and as may be modified from time to time.

5. The workman when offered appointment and posted as aforesaid shall report for duties within 7 days from receipt of the offer otherwise it shall be construed that the workman has given up all his claims against the Bank and the offer shall stand as withdrawn automatically.
 6. In case the workman is employed elsewhere he will have to produce a proper discharge/relieving letter from the existing employer prior to joining Bank's services.
 7. The workman shall submit Bio-data in Bank's format and certificates for educational qualification, proof of age, casts (if applicable) etc. as per Bank's rules within 5 days from today.
 8. Both the parties hereby agree to file a copy of this settlement before the CGIT Jabalpur in case No. CGIT/LC/65/01 within 10 days from today with the request to pass the Award in terms of this settlement. Both the parties will jointly file copy of this settlement before the Hon'ble High Court, Jabalpur with the prayer that by virtue of this settlement the grievances stand resolved.
 9. This settlement will not be cited as a presedent in any of the proceedings before any authority.
 10. Both the parties shall submit implementation report within one month to RLC (C), Bhopal otherwise, it will be presumed that the settlement is fully implemented."
3. I have very carefully gone through the above mentioned terms of settlement. They are just and fair. Therefore on the basis of compromise reached between the parties, the award is passed in accordance with the terms of settlement mentioned above without any other as to costs.
4. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3676.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेंट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 34/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/269/2003-आई आर (बी. II)]

सी. गंगाधरन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3676.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 34/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-

Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of Central Bank of India, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-12011/269/2003-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

LOKADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005-THE SUNDAY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/34/2004

Presiding Officer : Shri C.M. Singh

The General Secretary,
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,
9, Sanwer Road, Hardev Niwas,
Ujjain (MP)

Workman/Union

Versus

The Regional Manager,
Central Bank of India, Regional Office,
6/3, Race Course Road,
Indore (MP)

.....Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Shri C. M. Singh, Presiding Officer,
CGIT Cum Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. Shri R. C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. Shri Ashish Agrawal
Advocate | Member |

AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of September-2005

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12011/269/2003/IR(B-II) dated 10-3-2004 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :-

"Whether the action of the management of Regional Manager, Central Bank of India, Indore in terminating the services of Shri Pankaj Bundela and not regularising the services in spite of his empanelment is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled for?"

2. In this case Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain, MP the learned counsel for workman Shri Pankaj Bundela/Union moved an application with the prayer to close this reference. It is mentioned in the body of this application that workman Shri Pankaj Bundela has been employed permanently with the Oriental Insurance Company Limited and therefore he does not want to prosecute this reference.

28759765-41

3. Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain (MP) the learned counsel for workman/Union submitted before this Lok Adalat that workman Shri Pankaj Bundela does not want to prosecute this reference as he has joined permanent service in the Oriental Insurance Company Ltd. He requested that the reference be dropped.

4. After having heard Shri Ram Nagvanshi, the General Secretary of the Union, we are of the considered opinion that there is left no dispute between the parties and therefore it shall be in the interest of justice to pass a No Dispute Award in this reference.

5. In view of the above, No Dispute Award is passed without any order as to costs.

6. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3677.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इलाहाबाद बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं.-2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 3/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/38/1999-आई आर (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3677.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 3/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 2 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of Allahabad Bank and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-12012/38/1999-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act. 1947.

(Arising out of 269/99-Ministry's Order No. L-12012/38/99/IR/B. II dated 10-6-99).

Complaint Petition No. 3 of 2003

PARTIES: The Bihar State Allahabad Bank
Employees Union.Complainant.

Versus

Allahabad Bank Zonal Office
(Now Nodal Regional Office,
Budh Marg, Patna).Opp. Party.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the union : None

On behalf of the O.P. : None

State : Jharkhand Industry : Banking.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 18th August, 2005.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act. 1947 filed by the complainant against the O.P. management mentioned above.

In this case neither the complainant nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. None also appeared on behalf of the O.P. It reveals from the record that the instant complaint case is pending since 2003 and in spite of giving sufficient opportunities both the sides failed to appear before this Tribunal. Therefore, there is reason to believe that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. In the circumstances the complaint petition is dismissed for default.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3678.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 66/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/292/2000-आई आर (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th September, 2005

S.O. 3678.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 66/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of Bank of India, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 14-9-2005.

[No. L-12011/292/2000-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**LOKADALAT HELD ON 4-9-2005-THE SUNDAY
THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR**

No. CGIT/LC/R/66/2001

Presiding Officer : Shri C.M. Singh

The General Secretary,
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,
Hardev Niwas, 9, Sanwer Road,
Ujjain. Workman/Union

Versus

The Regional Manager,
Bank of India, Regional Office,
Freeganj, Ujjain. (MP) Management

Bench of Lok Adalat

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Shri C. M. Singh, Presiding Officer,
CGIT-Cum-Labour Court,
Jabalpur | Chairman |
| 2. Shri R. C. Shrivastava,
Advocate | Member |
| 3. Shri Ashish Agrawal,
Advocate | Member |

AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of September, 2005

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12011/292/2000/IR(B. II) dated 28-3-2001 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :-

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of India, Regional Officer, Ujjain in terminating the service of Shri Om Prakash Parmar w.e.f. 14-11-1997 is justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. The reference is taken up in Lok Adalat today. On behalf of the management, an application has been moved with the prayer that the award be passed in terms of settlement in the interest of justice. Workman Shri Om Prakash Parmar and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi, General Secretary, Daily Wages Bank Employees Association, Ujjain also submitted that the matter has been compromised between both the parties regarding which the parties have filed memorandum of settlement today. Shri A.K. Shashi, Advocate for the management and workman Shri Om Prakash Parmar and his counsel Shri Ram Nagwanshi named above submitted that the award be passed in terms of memorandum of settlement.

The following are the terms of settlement :-

1. “The request to appoint Shri Om Prakash Parmar, the workman in regular Sub Staff cadre is hereby

accepted by the Bank Management as a gesture of goodwill. He will be appointed full time “Safai Karmchhari cum Hammal” in regular pay scale at first stage, as applicable in the Bank provided he is not found medically unfit for the said post by the Bank’s Doctor. The appointment shall be with prospective effect and in any of the offices/branches of the Bank under Ujjain Zone at the sole discretion of the Bank Management subject to the Union/workman fulfilling obligations on their part as mentioned here-in-after, in full and final satisfaction of all the claims of the workman against the Bank up to this date.”

2. The Union/workman, shall forthwith withdraw all the cases filed by them against the Bank before any forum including cases that are pending before Labour Enforcement Officer, Indore, Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and Conciliation Officer, Bhopal, Central Government Industrial Tribunal Cum Labour Court, Jabalpur, Authority under Payment of Gratuity Act (which is now pending in High Court, Jabalpur) etc. in relation to claimant’s claims for past service, back wages etc.
3. The Union/workman further undertakes and declares that the workman shall discharge his duties sincerely, faithfully and with devotion as he is expected of the employee of sub staff cadre and shall not raise any dispute/claims whatsoever pertaining to any matter prior to this date against the Bank Management.
4. The workman herein shall not be entitled to any seniority, back wages, gratuity or bonus or any other past service benefits etc. and he will be governed by the service conditions as are prevalent in the Bank and as may be modified from time to time.
5. The workman when offered appointment and posted as aforesaid shall report for duties within 7 days from receipt of the offer otherwise it shall be construed that the workman has given up all his claims against the Bank and the offer shall stand as withdrawn automatically.
6. In case the workman is employed elsewhere he will have to produce a proper discharge/relieving letter from the existing employer prior to joining Bank’s services.
7. The workman shall submit Bio-data in Bank’s format and certificates for educational qualification, proof of age, casts (if applicable) etc. as per Bank’s rules within 5 days from today.
8. Both the parties hereby agree to file a copy of this settlement before the CGIT Jabalpur in case No. CGIT/LC/66/01 within 10 days from today with the request to pass the Award in terms of this settlement. Both the parties will jointly file copy of this settlement before the Hon’ble High Court, Jabalpur with the prayer that by virtue of this settlement the grievances stand resolved.

9. This settlement will not be cited as a precedent in any of the proceedings before any authority.
10. Both the parties shall submit implementation report within one month to RLC (C), Bhopal otherwise, it will be presumed that the settlement is fully implemented."

3. I have very carefully gone through the above mentioned terms of settlement. They are just and fair. Therefore on the basis of compromise reached between the parties, the award is passed in accordance with the terms of settlement mentioned above without any order as to costs.

4. Copy of the award be sent to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India as per rules.

C. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

रोजगार एवं प्रशिक्षण महानिदेशालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3679. — केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 यथा संशोधित 1987 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (2) एवं (4) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा रोजगार एवं प्रशिक्षण महानिदेशालय (श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय) के निम्नलिखित अधीनस्थ कार्यालयों को जिनके कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :

(क) महिला विकलांग व्यावसायिक पुर्नवास केन्द्र वडोदरा।

(ख) विकलांग व्यावसायिक पुर्नवास केन्द्र भुवनेश्वर।

(ग) क्षेत्रीय महिला व्यावसायिक प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, इंदौर

[सं. डोजीईटी-11017/2/2005-हिन्दी]

जेसी फ्रांसिस, उप सचिव

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING

New Delhi, the 23rd September, 2005

S.O. 3679.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) and (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use For Official Purpose of the Union) Rules, 1976 (As Amended 1987, the Central Government hereby notifies the following Subordinate Offices of the Directorate General of Employment & Training (Ministry of Labour & Employment), the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

- Vocational Rehabilitation Centre for Handicapped Women, Vadodara.
- Vocational Rehabilitation Centre for Handicapped, Bhubneshwar.
- Regional Vocational Training Institute for Women, Indore.

[No. DGET-11017/2/2005-Hindi]

JESSIE FRANCIS, Dy. Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3680. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में

निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचात (संदर्भ सं. 16/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2005 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/202/2003-आई आर (बी.-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2005

S.O. 3680.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 16/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the Management of UCO Bank, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2005.

[No. L-12011/202/2003-IR(B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT-16/2004.

Reference No. L-12011/202/2003-IR (B-II)

UCO Bank Staff Association (Raj.),

Through Secretary General,

UCO Bank, 28-A, Bani Park,

Jaipur

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The Assistant General Manager,
UCO Bank,
Arcade International, 2nd floor,
Ajmer Road, Jaipur

2. The Branch Manager,,
UCO Bank, Tonk Road,
Jaipur

.....Non-Applcant

PRESENT:

Presiding Officer : Sh. R.C. Sharma

For the applicant : Sh. Vinayak Joshi

For the non-applicants : Sh. Surendra Singh

Date of award : 16-8-2005

AWARD

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause 'D' of Sub-section 1 & 2 (A) to Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) has referred this industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

"Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank, Jaipur for not giving permanent status to Sh. Ramovtar Jawa as part-time Sweeper in 1/3 pay of regular scale after 13 years of service is justified? If not, to what relief the claimant is entitled to and from which date?"

2. The applicant-union has pleaded in its claim statement that its member Sh. Ramovtar Jawa is working as a part-time cleaner (Sweeper) at the university extension counter of the non-applicant bank at Tonk w.e.f. 1990, who was paid the wages @ Rs. 200 per month on his initial employment, which was increased to Rs. 440 per month, whereas the casual workers who joined the bank subsequent to him were given the benefit of one-third and two-third pay-scale. When the workman raised the industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer. He was getting the consolidated wages @ Rs. 740 per month w.e.f. July, 2000 in accordance with the BPS treating him to be a casual worker. He had written a letter (Annexure 1) on 9-1-2000 to the bank authorities, but the wages admissible to him were not granted, which is defined as unfair labour practice under Section 25-T of the Act. It is further pleaded that the workman has submitted several representations before the bank, but his request was not acceded to Stating that the workman has completed a length of 13 years of employment, the Union has urged that he be treated as a permanent employee and the wages in the pay scale of one-third be granted to him w.e.f. 1990.

3. Resisting the claim the non-applicants in their written counter have averred that the workman was engaged to work as a part-time casual worker and was paid according to his performance of the work. The wages in the pay-scale of one-half and one-third are given on the basis of the measurement of the carpet area which the workman has to sweep. The non-applicants have denied that other workers in the category of the disputant have been granted the wages in the pay-scale of one-third, that the carpet area which is being cleaned by the workman is nearly 400 sq. ft. and the wages are being paid to him in accordance with the circular dated 1.1.90 (Ex. M-1).

4. On the pleadings of both the parties, the following points for determination were framed :—

- I. Whether the workman Shri Ramovtar Jawa is working continuously as cleaner under the employment of the non-applicant bank w.e.f. 1990?
- II. Whether the non-applicant bank has exercised unfair labour practice in not awarding the due benefits and status to the workman?
- III. Whether the workman is entitled to permanent status as part-time sweeper in 1/3rd pay of regular scale?

5. In the evidence, the Union has submitted the affidavit of WW-1 Ramovtar Jawa and on behalf of the non-applicants, the counter-affidavit of MW-1, Shiv Prasad Aggarwal has been placed on the record. Both the witnesses have been cross-examined by the respective opposite representative. Both the parties have also led the documentary evidence on the record.

6. I have heard both the parties and have scanned the record. The point-wise discussion follows as under :—

Point Nos. I, II & III

7. Since all these three points are identical, they are being discussed together hereunder :—

8. The Ld. representative for the Union contends that the disputant is continuously working w.e.f. 1990 till now at the extension counter of the non-applicant bank as a sweeper, who is sweeping more than 850 sq. ft. area of the bank which includes the verandah outside the office room and his case is governed by the circular Ex. M-1, who is entitled for one-third scale of wages. His next contention is that he had written letters Exbts. 1, 2 and 3, but he was denied the permanent status on the ground that he has passed 8th class, whereas the person possessing the educational qualification up to 6th can only be granted permanent status. His submission is that the workman has given his undertaking to this effect. The Ld. representative has also contended that measurement of the premises of extension counter shown by the non-applicant is contradictory.

9. Responding to the submissions, the Ld. representative for the bank contends that admittedly the disputant is a part-time workman, who is being paid in accordance with the norms prescribed by the bank and he is not entitled to get the one-third wages of the regular pay-scale. The Ld. representative has also submitted that the workman has not placed any measurement of the premises before the Court and there is no contradiction regarding the measurement furnished on behalf of the bank before the Court.

10. I have bestowed my thoughtful considerations to the rival contentions.

11. There is no dispute that the disputant is working as a part-time sweeper under the employment of the non-applicant bank w.e.f. the year 1990. The circular Ex. M-1 dated 1-1-1990 reads that "it has been agreed that the following norms are to be adopted for determining the wages of part-time sweepers :

Floor Area	Remuneration per month
Less than 800 sq. ft.	Rs. 200/- consolidated
850 sq. ft. to 2000 ft.	wages per month 1/3rd scale of wages

12. Thus, in accordance with the circular, a part-time workman who is sweeping in the floor area between 850 sq. ft. will be entitled to 1/3rd scale of wages. The workman's case is that he is sweeping more than 850 sq. ft. floor area and hence he is entitled to 1/3rd scale of wages, whereas the stand of the bank is that the workman is sweeping the carpet area nearly 400 sq. ft. of the extension counter, who is being paid according to this measurement.

13. True it is that the Union in its claim statement has not depicted the floor area which the disputant is sweeping. But in the cross-examination, to a question the workman has emphatically stated that the carpet area of the extension counter hall is nearly 440 sq. ft. and the area of the verandah and ladders is also of the equal measurement to it. According to him, the total floor area of the extension counter is nearly 860 sq. ft. As against it, the non-applicants in their written-counter have stated at

para 4 that the carpet area of the extension counter is nearly 400 sq. ft.

14. After the closure of the Union's evidence on 15-4-2005, on behalf of the bank the measurement certificate Ex. M-2 dated 10-6-2005 was placed before the Court. This is a certification by a private architect who certifies that the "said extension counter occupies only one hall of the size 18' 3" x 18' 3" or 334.86 sq. ft." It is noteworthy here that the circular Ex. M-1 provides the scale of wages on the basis of floor area, whereas the non-applicants instead of exhibiting the floor area of the extension counter have only shown the carpet area of the hall of the extension. As stated earlier, the workman in his cross-examination has deposed that the carpet area of the hall is nearly 440 sq. ft. and he has also indicated the additional floor area which includes the verandah and ladders of the extension counter. On these facts, the non-applicants have failed to satisfy the Court that the floor area which is being swept by the workman is below 850 sq. ft. and the explanation rendered by the workman in his cross-examination appears to be reasonable and plausible which deserves to be accepted.

15. It has also been contended by the Union in its claim statement that the junior workmen, viz., Dinesh, Murari Lal, Mahendra and Shankar Dutt Sharma have been awarded 1/3rd scale of the wages and has furnished the details to this effect. In the cross-examination, MW-1 Shiv Prasad Aggarwal has admitted that the services of Dinesh, Murari Lal, Mahendra and Shankar Dutt have been regularized, who were engaged as part-time employees. It is further his clear admission in the cross-examination that the four junior workers have been awarded 1/3rd scale of wages as per the circular. On the basis of the admission of the management witness. It is manifestly clear that the management has characterized the unfair labour practice under clause 10 of the 5th Schedule of the Act by depriving the workman 1/3rd scale of wages even when he is performing his duties from 1990 and has awarded this benefit to the junior persons to him.

16. To conclude, it is held that the workman is continuously working as a cleaner (sweeper) w.e.f. 1990, who is entitled to the permanent status as part-time sweeper in 1/3rd pay of regular scale and the non-applicant bank has characterized the unfair labour practice in not awarding the due benefit and status to him. All the three points, therefore, are decided in favour of the Union and against the non-applicants.

17. In the result, the reference is answered in the affirmative in favour of the applicant-union and against the non-applicants and it is held that the action of the

management of UCO bank in not giving permanent status to the workman Ramovtar Jawa as Part-time sweeper in 1/3rd pay of regular scale is unjustified. The workman is entitled to get 1/3rd scale of wages from the date his juniors were awarded this benefit. An award is passed in these terms accordingly.

18. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Central Government for publication under Section 17(1) of the Act.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 2005

का. आ. 3681.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा-1 की उप धारा (3) द्वारा शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा 01 अक्टूबर, 2005 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करती है, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय-4 (44 व 45 धारा के सिवाय जो पहले से प्रवृत्त हो चुकी है) अध्याय-5 और 6 [धारा-76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा-77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है] के उपबंध उत्तरांचल राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :—

राजस्व ग्राम	राजस्व परगना	तहसील	जिल्ला
नगरपालिका क्षेत्र काशीपुर	नगरपालिका क्षेत्र काशीपुर	काशीपुर	उद्यम सिंह नगर

[सं. एस-38013/59/2004-एस.एस.-1]

के. सी. जैन, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2005

S. O. 3681.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government hereby appoints the 1st October, 2005 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except Sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapter-V and VI [except sub-section (1) of Section 76 and Sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Uttaranchal namely :—

Revenue Village	Revenue Pargana	Tehsil	District
Municipal Areas of Kashipur	Municipal Areas of Kashipur	Kashipur	Udhamsingh Nagar

[No. S-38013/59/2004-S.S.-1]

K. C. JAIN, Director